

SYLVA.

FAMILIAR LETTERS UPON Occasional Subjects.

By SAMUEL PARKER, Gent.

*Quod si vita est optanda sapienti : profecto
nullam aliam ob causam optaverim, quam
ut aliquid efficiam quod vita dignum sit,
& quod utilitatem legentibus, etsi non ad
eloquentiam, quia tenuis in nobis facundie
rivus est, ad vivendum tamen afferat :
quod est maxime necessarium.*

Lactant. Lib. de Opificio Dei.

L O N D O N :

Printed for J. P. and sold by J. Nutt near Stationers
Hall. MDCCI.

*Son of
Bishop
Parker*

7/817



TO
Sir Femmet Raymond
OF
BARTON
IN
BERKS.

SIR,
THO' the Name Prefixt promises a Panegyrick as Inseparable from such a Subject and such an Occasion; Yet the Many Excellences you display, bid so surprizing a Defiance to all the Measures of Encomium that for both our Sakes I'll continue satisfi'd with the Contemplation of what I cannot describe, and expect to be as soon in a Capacity of returning your Favours as of reaching your Character; Favours Such and so Many, as if they had been design'd to vie with your Good Qualities both in Number and Extent; yet none of 'em comparable to the Pleasure and Benefit of your Conversation and Example. Indeed Nothing short of your Piety, Prudence, and Modesty could
A 2 justify

The Epistle Dedicatory.

justify some Instances of your Beneficence, which the Ignorant and Envious might otherwise mistake for a Blaze of Profuseness.

But because I know, Sir, you wish to be transacted with more familiarly, I'll turn a Dedication into a Preface, and releasing you as a Patron attack you as a Reader: Not with a Beadroll of Excuses and Palliations, nor the Lives of the Parties I sent my Letters to. 'Twere hard if a Man might not expose his own Epistles but his Correspondent must be Subpæna'd. Then as for Apologies, there's no room for them, when once the Press has done its Duty, at least from a Callow Writer. The bare Levying of a Few Pages, without any further Overt-act, is made High Treason o'course; as if all Books were to suit all Capacities and Conditions (for so might I plead, were I dispos'd) and there must be no Primmers and Construing-Books forsooth! because the World swarms with Philosophers —

To proceed Methodically; Some of my Criticks are as Young or Younger than My self, but the Majority, you may believe, somewhat Older. Those of the First Member of my Division have my free Consent to be Severe. 'Tis such a Violation of Fundamentals to creep into the Light without their Midwifery as I can never atone for but by resigning My self into their Hands.
My

The Epistle Dedicatory.

My Senior Criticks I subdivide into Those who are sure 'tis impossible any Thing worthy a Cast of their Eye can come alas! from the Pen of a Forward Young Man, and Those who do his Performances so much Credit as at a venture to pronounce him a Transcriber and a Plagiarié. Set the First over against the Last, and see, Sir, what you can make of 'em. However I impose not upon the Former the Pennance of a Perusal 'till they find themselves Old enough to master Prejudices; but must assure the Latter, I know of No Body I'm a Debtor to, unless Every Authour is such to the Correctour of the Press.

Receive, Sir, the little Tender I bring of my most Cordial and Profound Respects; and whatever of it shall merit a Place in your Esteem, ascribe to the Advantages of a Liberal Education in the Magnificent Metropolis of the Learned World, under the gentle Auspices of the Reverend Dr. Bathurst, the Celebrated President of TRINITY COLLEGE, my Sense of whose Signal Kindnesses I cannot express better than by declaring them Equal to those he was pleas'd to heap upon my Father before me.

*Having especial Reasons to suspect my own Abilities I offer you these Papers as well to engage your Protection as to give you a Taste of my Gratitude. Entertain 'em rather as a Bribe than a Present. And yet excuse me,
Sir,*

The Epistle Dedicatory.

*Sir, if I say the Conclusions and Hypotheses
I advance, are erected upon sure Foundati-
ons, and fetch'd into as narrow a Compass as
Matters wou'd bear. Did I not assert This,
I were Unfaithful to my own Argument, a
Traitour to the most Sacred Truths, and
an Impudent Abuser of your Goodness while
I study to proclaim Myself,*

Sir,

Your Most

Oblig'd and Most

Humble Servant,

S. PARKER.

Oxford
September
29th 1700.

THE

THE CONTENTS.

- Letter 1st. **T**HE Doctrin of the Identity of the Body at the Resurrection vindicated against Modern Cavils.
- 2d. Of a Cerberus Common-wealth.
- 3d. Of Sir William Temple's Notion of the Origin of Government.
- 4th. Of Conversation.
- 5th. Of Government in General.
- 6th. An Introduction to the History of the Anarchical and Levelling Opinions.
- 7th. Of Honour.
- 8th. Of the Soul.
- 9th. Two or Three Obvious Considerations Evidencing the Truth and Divine Authority of the Sacred Records.
- 10th. Of Good Nature.
- 11th. Parentalia.
- 12th. A Recipe for Lovers.

The

The most offensive Errors of the Press are thus to be mended.

PAge 3. line 9. for *have* read *has*. p. 11. l. 22. for *Gentlemen* r. *Gentleman*. p. 24. l. 28. for *Observations* r. *Observation*. p. 38. l. 1. for *ἐπιτοχὴν* r. *ἐπιτυχὴν*. lb. l. 3. for *κολακεύεται* r. *κολακεύσεται*. p. 43. l. 15. for *In this Apologet* r. *In his Apologet*. p. 91. l. 27. after *Man* r. *and Man*. p. 92. l. 1. for *fragrant* r. *flagrant*. p. 93. l. 20. for *Immortal* r. *Immoral*. p. 113. l. 12. for *Fifth Monarch* r. *Fifth-Monarchy*. p. 128. l. 27. for *devested* r. *divested*. p. 155. after *whatever* r. *or*. p. 158. l. 24. d. the last Comma. p. 178. l. 1. for *Excellency* r. *Excellence*. Ibid. l. 22. for *Revolution* r. *Revolutions*. p. 181. l. 18. d. *first*. p. 204. l. 29 for *quidem* r. *Quidam*. p. 205. l. 19. d. *of*. and l. 24. after *not add of*. p. 206. l. 18. for *παραωσῶν* r. *παραδωκ*. p. 215. l. 11. for *sweetents* r. *sweetens*. p. 220. l. 18. for *his* r. *has*. p. 240. l. 24. for *profess* r. *profess'd*.

(1)

The Doctrine of the
Identity of the Body

AT THE
Resurrection,

Vindicated against Modern Cavils.

LETTER I.

Honoured Sir,

BY yours of the Tenth Instant you advise me to lay together those Animadversions upon some Objections lately advanc'd against the Doctrine of the Identity of the Body at the Resurrection, which I communicated to you by word of mouth, in order to send 'em abroad into the World. Now the Advice of so good a Friend, and so judicious a Man being an Obligation, an Encouragement, and a Security, 'twere somewhat worse than Ill Manners not to submit: And

B

tho'

tho a *Laick* and a *Youngster* too, yet I persuade my self even the Partiality of the present Generation will not condemn me for opposing so celebrated a Divine, and so sagacious a Philosopher as I am now going to set upon, in a matter of such Importance so miserably mismanag'd and abus'd. At least, for what concerns Mr. *Lock*, if an Old Layman writes *Heterodoxly*, a Young One, I fancy, may rebuke him *Orthodoxly*, and not be afraid, much less, as some have been, ambitious of any Answer from him, it being my Design to expose the Fallness of a pernicious *Thesis* he has recommended to the World, and if I can but effectually expose That, twill scarce break my heart, I assure him, tho' he denys me the *Glory* of being taken notice of by him.

What Assertions on one side or other gave occasion to this part of the Dispute between Two such Eminent Persons, which relates to the Identity of the Body at the Resurrection, I shall not take upon me to examin; nor whether Mr. *Lock's* Notion of Identity agrees or disagrees either with the Principles of Right Reason, or with the Articles of our Faith; nor whether his Learn'd Adversary has represented his Notion as he understood it himself, or built any other Inferences upon it than what it wou'd fairly admit of. The only Province

I intend to assign my self is that of enquiring, with all the Modesty I can, into the Opinions which these Two Illustrious Men have maintain'd in exprefs Terms concerning the Identity of the Body at the Resurrection. Nor durst I have embarqu'd in so considerable an Enquiry, but that the Mistakes into which either of These Two Disputants have run, seem'd so mischievously to affect the Article of the Resurrection, that 'twere better a *Novice* than No Body, should take notice of 'em.

I am well satisfy'd Mr. *Lock's* Judicious Adversary never design'd to assert any Propositions tending to the subversion of any Article of Faith, and 'twere Unpardonable to ascribe the false steps he has made in the heat of the Controversy to want of Sincerity or Penetration: But tho' a charitable Construction ought to be put upon the Intentions of the Assertour, yet the pernicious Assertions themselves can deserve no Favour at our hands. Indeed, while we treat 'em gently, we do not more betray the Cause of Truth, than aggravate the Failures of the Assertour, whose Integrity or Understanding is certainly much better vindicated by the Plea of Human Infirmities than either by his own Authority or the Plausibleness of his Argument. But be that to the purpose or otherwise, I'm sure

the Position laid down by Mr. Lock's most Learned Adversary in the 34th and 35th Pages of his Answer to Mr. Lock's second Letter are by no means defensible, either as a Divine's or a Philosopher's. The Passage is this. *I do not say the same Individual Particles of Matter which were united at the point of Death shall be rais'd up at the last day, for there must be a great Alteration in them in a ling'ring Disease, as if a fat Man falls into a Consumption: I do not say the same Particles which the Sinner had at the very time of Commission of his Sins; for then a long Sinner must have a vast Body, considering the continual spending of Particles by Perspiration, but that which I suppose is, that it must be the same material Substance which was vitally united to the Soul here, and pag. 37. 38. having cited that Text in St. John, All that are in the Graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth, they that have done good unto the Resurrection of Life, and they that have done Evil unto the Resurrection of Damnation. John. 5. 28. 29. he tells us that by comparing this with other places, particularly the 2 Corinth. 5. 10. we find that the words are to be understood of the Substance of that Body to which the Soul was united, and not of those Individual Particles which were in the Grave. Now with humble Submission to so great an Authority, I do not see how all that are*

in their Graves, i. e. all the Bodies that are in their Graves shou'd properly imply any other than Bodies consisting of the very same Individual Particles of Matter that were laid in the Grave: and I must own Mr. *Lock* has not without Reason observ'd, that since his Adversary cou'd mean no other Substance but what comes out of the Grave, and since no Substance, no Particles come out, but what were in the Grave, and since none of the Particles that were separate from the Body by Perspiration, before the point of Death, were laid up in the Grave, his Adversary is not to be reconcil'd with himself, unless he means by the same Body the same Individual Particles which were united at the Point of Death. For as the *Holy Scriptures* promise the Resurrection of no other Body than what shall be materially the same with that laid in the Grave; so what can be more absurd than to talk of the Rising again of such Particles as were never bury'd? Nay what is this but in plain Terms to deny the Sameness of the Rising Body? If those Particles, which before the point of Death were by Perspiration *dispers'd abroad* are to be united to the Body at the Resurrection, the same reason that induces us to believe any of those Particles so dispers'd by Perspiration shall be united to the Rising Body, will induce us to be-

lieve, that *all* shall, which over and above the Absurdity I mention'd before, must make so vast a Body, that Mr. *Lock's* Adversary himself excepts against it, p. 35. Besides that this Supposition also destroys the proper Notion of the Identity of the Body, which imports an absolute Sameness in *Quantity*, as well as *Matter*, tho not of *Quality*. I grant, it may please God at the Resurrection of the Dead to add to the Body rising, or risen, such new Particles as may compleat the Perfection of a *Glorify'd Body*, but then those Particles are purely *additional*, and we may beleive that the same Particles of Matter which the Grave receiv'd shall be all rais'd and united again, which is the Sense of the Article of the Resurrection, whether we believe other *Perfectionative* Particles shall be added to them or not. But this is not to make it necessary that Particles which have some time or other, before the Point of Death, made up part of an Human Body, and were afterwards lost in Perspiration, shou'd be reckon'd into the Substance of that Body, which having been *bury'd* is to *rise*. And therefore Mr. *Lock's* learn'd Adversary confutes again his own *Indefinite Notion* of the same Body, when proving, as he justly might, the material Identity of Human Bodys at the general Resurrection from the
material

material Identity of *our Saviour's* rais'd Body, he puts the Question, *What HE was seen of Five Hundred Brethren at once*, (pag. 39.) and answers, *It was Christ that died.* That Body of *Christ* which these Disciples beheld was the same materially which died upon the Cross, without the Accession of any Particles that before his dying upon the Cross had been dispers'd by Perspiration. Again, when the same Learn'd Person has remark'd (pag. 43) that St. Paul supposes the Rising Body must be the same material Substance to which the Soul was before united, because it is the same Substance which is said to be sown in *Corruption, Weakness and Dishonour*, he has prov'd upon himself, that only those Particles of the Body that were sown, which constituted the Body at the Point of Death, and not any other that before that Instant had made a part of it, shou'd be rais'd in *Incorruption, Glory and Power*; for a confirmation of which Doctrine the *Apostle* appeals to a common Instance of the Divine Providence. *Thou Fool* (says he to the Sceptick mentioned in the former verse) *that which thou sowest is not quickned except it die, And that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that Body that shall be, but bare grain, it may chance of Wheat or some other grain. But God gives it a Body as it has pleased him,*

and to every Seed its own Body, 1 Cor. 15. v. 36, 37, 38. whence it is plain, the Apostle argues the material Identity of the rising Body to be consistent with that Change of Qualities which shou'd be necessary towards its Glorification, because these words are in answer to that Question v. 35. *How are the Dead raised up, and with what* (now with what kind of) *Body do they come?* Now if the Apostle affirms that there shall be a perfect Identity, saving in the Qualities of the rising Body; what can be clearer than that he maintains the rising Body shall in *Matter* and *Quantity* be the same with the Body that was Bury'd; as a *Grain of Wheat* changes its *Qualities* or that Modification of Parts upon which its *Qualities* depend, after it has been sown; and yet the Parts after that change, are materially the same with those that were sown, and in *Quantity* too, tho indeed a new *Quantity* of Matter once distinct from it be so superadded to the *Quantity* of Matter which made up the Seed when it was first sown, as to constitute first the *Blade*, then the *Ear*, after that the *Ripe Corn in the Ear*, St. Mark. 4. v. 28. And therefore when the Learn'd Answerer of Mr. Lock's second Letter makes the Apostle's τὸ ἴδιον σῶμα, to signify that *Body in miniature which is afterwards so much enlarg'd* (p. 40, 41.) tho' his Observation be just and

and true in it self; yet I humbly conceive he has mistaken the proper Scope and Intendment of the Apostle in that Place, whose business it was not, when he had offer'd an Objection against himself, to describe the *structure of the Body of a Grain*, but to insist upon the *Identity of the Substance of it notwithstanding the Variation of its Qualities*. And therefore he says God gives it a Body, καὶ ὡς ἠθέλησε, such as, in Qualities, not in Matter, (for God gave it the Matter of a Body when he made it first a grain) it hath pleased him, and to every Seed τὸ ἰδίον σῶμα, a peculiar Constitution with additional Matter to make up the Blade, &c. as all Flesh is not the same Flesh, &c. v. 39. Besides, if we allow that the rising Body shall consist of any other Particles or of Fewer than were repositied in the Grave, we must believe it must be made up either of all the Particles which during the Life of the Party were at any time united to it, or of so many only as belong to it at such a particular time. Not the first, because then a long Sinner must have a vast Body; nor yet the latter, because then (as Mr. Lock very rightly concludes pag. 175. of his Reply) the Sinner's Body will be no more the same Body in which the Things were done in the distant Parts of his Life, then that is the same Body, in which

which half or three Quarters or more of the Individual Matter that made it then up, is now wanting. The End for which the Apostle says the Body shall be rais'd is, that it may suffer for those ill Things, or be rewarded for those good Things, to the doing of which it has been instrumental. Now if the Body to be rais'd shall not be that materially and strictly which was bury'd, it will be that Body which it had some time before, and how then can it receive Reward or Punishment for the Good or Ill Things done in it from the time it was that same Body which is to be rais'd, to the Point of Death? For if the Body is to be rewarded or suffer for the things done in it, then the very same Body is to be rewarded or suffer wherein the Things were done; and if the very same Body, then not that Body which the Good Man or Sinner had before he had done *all those* good or ill Things for which he was to account at the last Day; otherwise the End of its being rais'd wou'd in part be frustrated. But this Objection is of no Force, provided we assert those Particles shall be reunited into a Body which were bury'd, because whatever we make to be the Principle and Foundation of Identity, 'tis agreed on all sides, that so long as the life of the Body is uninterrupted, whatever Particles it may
from

from time to time have lost by Perspiration or acquir'd by Nutrition, the several Actions perform'd at Distant times by the Body of the same Person are to be imputed to it as to one and the same Individual, the Principle of Action in Human Bodies remaining Uninterrupted as long as the Union between Soul and Body. But to take my leave of Mr. *Lock's* learn'd Adversary, and advance toward himself. Let me once again advertise you, Sir, that I shall not make it my business to enquire whether or no his placing Certainty in the Perception of the Agreement or Disagreement of Ideas weakens the Credibility of the Article of the Resurrection; or whether his Adversary has apply'd such Arguments as prove it does; or whether his Notion of *Personal Identity* be bottom'd upon Principles of Right Reason, or Consistent with the Articles of the Creed. No; I shall confine my self to the Discussion of those Doctrines that Ingenious Gentlemen has declar'd for as to the Identity or Diversity of the Body at the Resurrection. He lets us know (*pag. 166. of his Reply*) *that he acknowledges the Resurrection of the Dead to be an Article of the Christian Faith, but he does not remember in the New Testament (wherein are contain'd all the Articles of the Christian Faith) where the Resurrection of the SAME*
Body

Body is as much as mention'd. Nay, which he looks upon to be very remarkable, he does not remember in any place of the New Testament (where the general Resurrection of the last Day is spoken of) any such Expression as the Resurrection of the Body, much less of the SAME Body. Alas! the little Glosses and Evasions great Men will be straining for, when a fit of Singularity comes upon 'em, which, it seems, is as injurious to the Memory as to the Judgment! Else, Mr. Lock might have easily recollected that, altho' those very Words, Resurrection of the Body, or of the same Body, do not occur in the New Testament, yet the same Words in a different Form of Syntax, or Wordsexactly and evidently equivalent to 'em, occur both in the New Testament and in the Old (which, with Mr. Lock's leave, is not without its Articles of Faith too) I know, says Job cap. 19. v. 25, 26, 27. That my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter Day upon the Earth; And tho after my Skin Worms destroy this Body, yet^r in my Flesh shall I see God; whom I shall see for my self, and mine Eyes shall behold, and not another, though my Reins be consumed within me. Here we see THIS BODY, and this Body the same with that which Worms shall destroy, that is, the Body that was to be bury'd, yet, says he, in MY FLESH, i. e.
in

in the Flesh of this Body which Worms shou'd destroy, as is evident from the *Conjunction Yet*, which stands a *Redditive* to the *Adversative Conjunction Though*, shall I FOR MY SELF WITH MINE EYES and NOT ANOTHER (all by virtue of the same Particle *Yet* answering to a Person having again that Body which Worms shou'd destroy) see God. To the same Effect, *Isaiah 26. v. 19. Thy dead Men shall live, together with my Dead Body shall they arise: awake and sing ye that dwell in the Dust, for thy Dew is as the Dew of Herbs, and the Earth shall cast out the Dead.* I confess we have not yet the *Resurrection of the Body*, or of the same Body, but here we find the Prophet asserting, that HIS DEAD BODY SHALL ARISE, and that, I think, might have satisfy'd Mr. Lock, as well as if he had said, *There shall be a Resurrection of my Body*, or of my dead Body, i. e. of that same Body of mine which shall be laid in the Grave. I am not ignorant, that some Commentatours interpret these places to another Sense than what respects the general Resurrection at the last day, but the Majority and the Ancientest understand 'em as Testimonies of the general Resurrection, and even those who expound 'em to a Different purpose, do not exclude the Importance of 'em to prove the general Resurrection.

To

To come to the New Testament; How will Mr. L. disengage himself from that Text Rom. 8. v. 11. *But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the Dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the Dead, shall also quicken your mortal Bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you?* Does not ζωοποιήσας τοὺς ἐν ἡμῶν σώματα in a Passage where the Apostle is speaking of the Resurrection of *Christ*, and inferring that of ours from it, sound very much like the Resurrection of our *Human Bodies*? nay does it not sound very like the Resurrection of the same Body, the Apostle there making a Comparison between *Christ's* Resurrection and Ours, and it being not question'd by Mr. Lock himself but that *Christ was raised with the same Body*? (Reply pag. 179.) tho, 'tis true, he has been pleas'd to deny both the *Inference* and *Parallel* which the Apostle has made; the *Inference*, for he professes (p. 179. of his Reply) *he does not see how it follows from the Resurrection of Christ, that Mankind shall be rais'd with the same Body, as Christ was raised with the same Body*; nay, as he apprehends the matter, *If they must keep Proportion with his in sameness, then we must believe, that every Man shall be rais'd with the same Lineaments and other Notes of Distinction he had at the time of his Death, even with his Wounds yet open, if he had any, because our Saviour was*

was so rais'd, (pag. 179, 180.) though the Apostle cou'd see and urge the certainty of our mortal Bodie's Rising again, and of our Rising with the same Bodies, as *Christ* rose with the same Body (for he has express'd the Parallel in indifferent Terms) from *Jesus's* having been rais'd from the Dead *by the same Spirit that dwelleth in us,* notwithstanding, perhaps, we may not be rais'd with the very same Features and Lineaments, nor those who dy'd newly wounded with their Wounds Open, because it was necessary in order to convince his Apostles and Disciples of the reality of his Resurrection, that *Christ* shou'd rise with the same Lineaments and Wounds wherewith he was bury'd, which Necessity holds not in the Case of our Resurrection, as Mr. *Lock* himself observes, *pag. 181, 182.* And as Mr. *Lock* has deny'd the Apostle's *Inference*, so has he deny'd his *Parallel* too, upon which that *Inference* is founded, for he says, (*pag. 180.*) *he thinks the case farr different between our Saviour, and those to be raised at the last Day,* and that not only because of the Circumstances mention'd before, that the same Wounds and Lineaments were found in our Saviour's Body at his Resurrection with which he died, whereas, he presumes, we shall not so rise at the last day ; but also, because
Christ's

Christ's Body *saw no Corruption*, as those of other Men, (pag. 180.) as if it were more reasonable to conclude, as Mr. L. does That because the Parts of our Bodies shall be moulder'd into Dust, we shall not rise again, as *Christ* did, whose Body was not dissolv'd in the Grave, with Bodies materially the same with those which were bury'd, than to conclude, as I do, that, because according to the Appointment of God, and the Predictions of his Prophets, *Christ's* Body rose the third day, before it was dissolv'd, therefore according to the Predictions of the old Prophets, of *Christ* and his Apostles understood in the plainest and most familiar Sense of the words, and according to that *Parallel* which St. *Paul* has insisted upon between the Resurrection of *Christ's* Body and ours, our Bodies, whatever Dissipations and Transmutations the Parts of 'em may have undergone before the general Resurrection, shall rise again, as *Christ's* did, without any Difference as to the *Matter* of 'em, tho, like his, as to the *Qualities* of 'em remarkably chang'd. And if it is not more reasonable, the Circumstance of our Saviour's rising with his pristin Features and Wounds, and eating and drinking after his Death, which Circumstance such reasons as do not, that we know of, concern any Man beside,
made

made necessary to him, will no more afford us grounds to imagin the *Parallel* which the Apostle mentions between Christ's Resurrection and ours, does not hold in every respect beside, than his Divinity's being reunited to his Humanity at his Resurrection. And this, I take it, is a clear and full solution of those Difficulties Mr. Lock has dwelt upon (*Reply pag. 179, 180, 181, 182, 183.*) But what if at last the *Resurrection of the Body*, or of the *same Body*, is an Expression which the New Testament affords not either in *Casu directo* or *obliquo*, in one Form of Syntax or another? Does it upon that account appear to so Ingenious a Gentleman as Mr. Lock, that the New Testament contains not Expressions equivalent; and that therefore the Doctrine of the Body's Identity at the Resurrection is not included in the Article of the Resurrection; or in other words, that *the Article of the Resurrection rightly understood*, is not that *that very Body which was bury'd shall be rais'd by God at the last day*? I respect Mr. Lock for his Parts and Learning, but I blush for him, when I see him thus out-bidding the *School-Men* themselves in *Wire-drawing*. Certainly were I to direct a Letter to him superscrib'd for Mr. *John Lock* at *Oates*, &c. he wou'd hardly be so scrupulous as not to break it open till I had sent him another superscrib'd

C

perſcrib'd for the ſame Mr. *John Lock* that
 lives at *Oates*. One wou'd think by the Con-
 ſtructions a Sort of People in the World
 put upon Articles of Faith, by the Ambi-
 guities they wou'd affix to 'em they
 thought God Almighty reveal'd himſelf
 only to perplex 'em, and that *Chriſt* came
 into the World to abrogate the *Old Dia-*
lects, as well as the *Old Law*. Elſe when
 we find in the New Teſtament, that *our*
Bodies ſhall riſe again, why may we not as
 fairly ſuppoſe, that *thoſe very Bodies of ours*
which were lay'd in the ground ſhall be rais'd
out of it again, as a Jeweller, that the ſame
Diamond for which he has lay'd down his
 Money, ſhall be put into his hands when
 the Merchant who ſold it him, tells him he
 will go and fetch the Jewell he ſold him?
 And if Mr. L. will be thus exceptious and
 ſcrupulous about the Senſe of one Article,
 he had beſt have a care he does not fall foul
 upon all the Reſt. If he doubts of the
 Reſurrection of the ſame Body, becauſe the
 word *ſame* is miſſing in the Article of the
Reſurrection of the Body, why ſhou'd he
 not doubt of the *Forgivenesſ of Sins*, be-
 cauſe in that Article the *Forgivenesſ of Sins*
 is not declar'd to be the ſame that we obtain
 thro' the Merits and Mediation of *Chriſt*?
 or of the *Unity of the Holy Catholick Church*,
 becauſe the Article runs not in the Terms
 of

of *One and the Same Holy Catholick Church?*
 or of *the Communion of Saints*, because *the same* is also wanting in that Article? nay,
 to ascend; Why may he not question
 whether the Article of *the Holy Ghost* is to
 be understood of *one and the same Holy*
Ghost? the several Articles of our Saviour's
Conception, Birth, &c. of One and the same
Jesus Christ? nay, further, the Article of
God the Father Almighty, of *One and the same*
God the Father Almighty, because all these
 Articles are without the word *same*? I
 know it will be answer'd in behalf of Mr.
 L. that those places of Scripture upon
 which all these Articles are built, and the
 Rational Arguments which prove the last,
 so plainly import the *Unity* of the *Subject*
 of each *Article*, that the word *Same* had
 not been necessary to signifie it, as in the
 Article of *the Resurrection of the Body*, if by
the Resurrection of the Body was to be un-
 derstood *the Resurrection of the same Body*.
 But that is the Thing which I insist upon,
 that those *Texts* of *Scripture*, upon which
 the Article of *the Resurrection of the Body*
is built, if not by the Word *Same*, yet by
 Words *perfectly equivalent*, as expressly im-
 port the *Identity of the rising Body*, as those
 Places of *Scripture* and Arguments from
 Right Reason, upon which the other Arti-
 cles of the *Creed* are built, import the

Sameness of God the Father Almighty, Jesus Christ our Lord, &c. Nor will Mr. Lock, I presume, suggest in reply, that to raise the very same Body, to reunite the very same Particles that were entomb'd however dispers'd and dispos'd of, appears so *miraculously difficult*, that the other Articles include no Difficulties equal to it, on the score of which we shou'd exclude the *belief* of the *Unity* or *Sameness* of their *Subjects*, and that therefore we are not as much oblig'd to believe the *Sameness* of the *rising Body*, as the *Sameness* of *God the Father Almighty, Jesus Christ our Lord, &c.* For first, no evident Contradiction resulting from the supposition of the Resurrection of the same Body, the Miraculousness and Difficulty of it is more than accounted for from the Consideration of God's Omnipotence, because as *the Foolishness of God is wiser than Men*; so *the Weakness of God is stronger than Men*, 1 Cor. i. v. 25. What to us may seem an unsurmountable Impediment, a most inexplicable Operation, cannot prove a *Trial of Skill* to that Infinite Majesty, who even created whatever can look like an Obstruction; And secondly the next Article of *the Life Everlasting* (not to mention any other) infers no less, if not a greater *Difficulty*, the Perpetuation of our Bodies to all Eternity seeming more
Wonderful

Wonderful and Inexplicable than the reuniting of certain dispers'd Particles of Matter, and therefore those *Streight-lac'd Gentlemen*, who receiving the other Articles of the Creed according to the full Importance of them, hesitate at the Doctrine of the Resurrection of the same Body, as a Doctrine implying absolute Impossibilities, must undoubtedly in the Eye of every considering Man appear much more unaccountable than the Doctrine to them.

Leaving therefore those Advantages which Mr. L. has taken from the Absence of the Word *Same*, I shall descend to another *Criticism* or *Shift*, or *what shall I call it*, if possible, as extraordinary as the former. He tells us (*Pag. 199. Reply*) that he who reads with attention that Discourse of St. Paul, 1 Cor. Chap. 15. where he discourses of the Resurrection, will see that he plainly distinguishes between the Dead that shall be raised and the Bodies of the Dead. For it is νεκροί, πάντες, οἱ are the Nominative Cases to ἐγερῶνται, ζωοποιήσονται, ἐκἐγερῶνται, all along, and not σώματα, Bodies, which one may with reason think would somewhere or other have been expressed, if all this had been said to prove it as an Article of Faith, that the very same Bodies shall be raised. He goes on, The same manner of speaking the Spirit of God observes all through the New Testament, where it is said, raise the

C 3

Dead,

Dead, quicken or make alive the Dead, the Resurrection of the Dead, Thus John cap. 5. v. 28, 29. Πάντες οἱ ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις ἀκούσονται τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκπορεύσονται οἱ τὰ ἀγαθὰ ποιήσαντες, εἰς ἀνάστασιν ζωῆς οἱ δὲ τὰ κακὰ ποιήσαντες εἰς ἀνάστασιν κείρας. Would not a well-meaning Searcher of the Scriptures be apt to think, that if the thing here intended by our Saviour were to teach, and propose it as an Article of Faith necessary to be believed by every one, that the very same Bodies of the Dead should be raised, the Words should rather have been, πάντα τὰ σώματα, ἃ ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις, i. e. all the Bodies that are in the Graves, rather than all who are in the Graves; which must denote Persons, and not precisely Bodies? Here you have his main Objection in its full Lustre. But first, it should seem, Mr. L. has split himself upon that very Absurdity which a little before he lays to the charge of his most Learn'd Adversary, for these Words of Mr. Lock's, if they prove anything, prove that the Soul too is lodg'd in the Grave, and raised out of it at the last day. (Mr. Lock's Reply pag. 169.) For if it can only be said of that which is laid in the Grave, that it shall be made alive or rais'd at the last day, then those Nominatives which denote Persons must mean no more than so much of those Persons as Rising again can truly and properly be predicated of, that is, their Bodies:

dies: And accordingly Mr. L. argues against his Adversary, (*Reply pag. 169.*) *No other Substance being raised but what hears his (Christ's) voice (see the Text just before cited by Mr. L. viz. John. 5. 28, 29.) And no other Substance hearing his voice but what being called comes out of the Grave, and no other Substance coming out of the Grave but what was in the Grave, any one must conclude, that the Soul, unless it be in the Grave, will make no Part of the Person that is raised, unless it be first made out, that a Substance which never was in the Grave may come out of it, or that the Soul is no Substance. (pag. 169. Reply)* How justly he mov'd this Argument against his Adversary, I am not to enquire; but I'm sure, it manifestly overthrows that Argument of his which I am now examining fetch'd from his Observation that it is said of Persons, not Bodies, *ζωοποιήσονται, ἡγερθήσονται*; for if Persons, in Contradistinction to Bodies are to rise again out of the Graves, then the Soul is to rise again as well as the Body out of the Grave; and if the Soul is to rise again out of the Grave, then it was laid in the Grave, unless it be first made out, that a Substance which never was in the Grave, nor heard his voice that call'd out whatever was in the Grave, may come out of it, or that the Soul is no Substance. And by this Con-

futation of his own Argument has
 Mr. *Lock* demonstrated the Necessity
 of the Body's Identity at the Re-
 surrection, for either those Texts of
 Scripture which Mr. *L.* says denote the
 Rising of our *Persons*, not of our *Bodies*,
 averr the *Resurrection* of our *Bodies* alone,
 of our *Souls*, or of our *Persons*: Not of ei-
 ther of the Latter according to Mr *Lock's*
 Confutation of his own Argument already
 apply'd, therefore of our *Bodies* alone.
 What *Bodies*? Certainly those that were laid
 ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις, unless Mr. *Lock* can first make
 it out, that any other Substance than that
 which was laid in the Grave, may be said
 to be rais'd again out of it, which he will find
 e'en as difficult a Task as to make out that
 a Substance which never was in the Grave
 may come out of it. Secondly, Why may
 we not reckon νεκρῶν as we find it join'd
 to ἀνδράσιν St. *Math.* 22. 31. Heb. 6. 2. to
 be of the Neuter Gender? or rather seeing
 that Epithet can agree to nothing but the
 Body, of what Gender can it so properly
 be as of the Neuter? And then Mr. *Lock's*
 Demand to produce a Text of Scripture
 where the *Resurrection of the Body* is menti-
 on'd, and his Observations that *Persons* not
Bodies; νεκροὶ, πάντες, οἱ, not σώματα are *Nomina-*
tive Cases τοῖς ἐνταφιασμένοις, &c. are both answer'd
 at once. Thirdly, πάντες οἱ ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις,
 and

and *κεκοιμηται* 1 Cor. 15. 29, 31, 52. are ordinary and vulgar Expressions to signify, as the reason of the Thing requires they shou'd, so much of the Persons as shou'd be laid *ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις*, so much of them as shou'd properly die. *And'tis no Wonder* Mr. Lock himself allows, (*Reply pag. 197.*) *that the Apostle mentioning the Bodies of Men at the Resurrection, should use a way of speaking suited to vulgar Notions, nor more a Wonder, I suppose, that our Saviour shou'd use the same before him.* The People had been accustom'd to such Expressions as these, *They are sick* when only *the Bodies* of the Parties were so; *They are sleepy* when only *their Bodies* were so; *They are lame*, when only *their Legs* were so, and ten Thousand the like; and therefore our Saviour and his Apostles, if they wou'd keep to the Common Language of the World, were to tell Men that those Persons whom the Grave had receiv'd were to rise again from the Dead, when they design'd to teach them that the same Numerical Bodies of Men which had been, or shou'd be laid in the Earth, shou'd again be raised out of it. And that the Apostle particularly meant thus, 1 Cor 15. is evident from what I have above enforc'd as an Argument, the *Parallel* he makes between *Christ's* Resurrection and ours, as elsewhere, so v. 16, 23. where,

says

says Mr. Lock (pag. 199.) *Persons* are said to be raised, not *Bodies*. But does not *xeis* signify a *Person* as much as *venes* *Persons*? and yet was any other Portion of *Christ's* Person rais'd to Life out of the Grave beside his *Body*? But Mr. L. advertises us (Reply pag. 200.) that in the 35th v. of this Chapter, *St. Paul* makes a *Distinction* between the *Dead* and the *Bodies of the Dead*, But some Men will say how are the *Dead* raised, and with what *Bodies* do they come? Which Words *Dead* and *They* if supposed to stand precisely for the *Bodies of the Dead*, the *Question* will run thus. How are the *Dead Bodies* raised, and with what *Bodies* do the *Dead Bodies* come? which seems to have no very agreeable Sense. What a *Spirit* of *Sophistry* have we hereagen! as if the *Apostle* having in the former part of the *Versé* mention'd the *Resurrection* of the *Body* *πῶς ἐγερθεῖται*, shou'd not most properly be conceiv'd to speak at large, in the latter part of it, of the *Persons* after the *Reunion* of their *Souls* and *Bodies*, to this Effect, But some will say, after what *Manner* are the *Bodies of the Dead* raised? and with what kind of *Body* when their *Souls* and *Bodies* are united do they come? Or as if the *Apostle* might not deliver his *Meaning* in a familiar *Way of Speaking*, so as when we say, *Such a Man came into the World*
with

with a vigorous Body and a noble Soul, or the like, whereas no Man strictly speaking comes into the World with a Soul and Body, but his Body and Soul make up that Him which comes into the World; as if, I say, the Apostle might not use such a familiar Way of expressing himself but it must be interpreted contrary to his Master's and his own plain meaning in other Passages, as well as to the reason of the Thing; and that notwithstanding 'tis clear from the Similitude which he immediately subjoins, that he cou'd not mean the Person shou'd be raised again to Life out of the Grave, but the Body, and that very Body that was laid in it. *Thou Fool*, says St. Paul, *that which thou sowest is not quickened except it die.* 'Tis most manifest in these Words, that that which is sown, dies, and is quicken'd, is the same Body or Grain, *materially* the same, but that which in dying and being quickened is chang'd as to its Qualities, for *that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that Body that shall be, but bare grain*, and God gives it a Body as it has pleas'd him, that is, God gives it *viz.* the Seed, the *τὸ σπέρμα*, the Matter whereof is not lost or perish'd by 'its dying and being reviv'd, such new Qualities as make it a Body of a very different Frame from what it was when it was sown, and such a new Quantity of Matter,

Matter, as in time constitutes the Substance of the Blade, Ear, and full Corn, in such a manner and measure as the nature of each Species requires, which I take to be the meaning of, *ἐκάστω τῶν σπερμάτων τὸ ἴδιον σῶμα*. And that we may not wonder how New Qualities shou'd be superinduc'd to the Rising Body, the Apostle bids us in the next Verse remember the wonderful variety of Qualities that discovers it self in the Flesh of Men, Beasts, Fishes, Birds, and in the 40th and 41st v. puts us in mind of the variety of Qualities and Properties between and in the Celestial and Terrestrial Bodys; *the Glory of the Celestial is one, and the Glory of the Terrestrial is another; there is one Glory of the Sun, and another Glory of the Moon, and another Glory of the Stars; for one Star differeth from another Star in Glory. So also is the Resurrection of the Dead τῶν νεκρῶν, to which σῶμα v. 44. is put in Apposition. It, that is, σῶμα, is sown in Corruption, Dishonour, Weakness, a Natural Body; It, i.e, the same σῶμα is raised in Incorruption, in Glory, in Power, a Spiritual Body, because those Qualities to which is owing the Corruptibleness of the Corruptible Body, of the Flesh and Blood, are inconsistent with that Incorruptibility and Immortality which our Mortal, Corruptible Body must put on. v. 50, 53. τὸ φθαρτὸν τῆτο, this very same corruptible Body, τὸ*
377

διητὸν τὺτο *this very same mortal Body* put in
 put 'in Apposition to the *οἱ νεκροί* of whom
 it is said *ἐκεθόντων αἰσθητοί, καὶ ἡμῶν ἀλλαγέμεθα.*
 What can be more significative and easy
 than the Apostle's Discourse thus laid to-
 gether and explain'd? And what more
 foreign to the Purpose than to make, as
 Mr. L. does, (p. 201.) the Dissimilitude
 of the Qualities of the Corruptible and In-
 corruptible Body, an Argument against
 the Identity of their Substance, and after-
 wards to close it with a Complaint that
 the Apostle has not asserted the Identity of
 the Rising Body in Terms plain and ex-
 press? (See also what he observes to the
 same purpose in the beginnig of pag. 198.)
 when, as I have prov'd from several Texts
 above, and might have prov'd from many
 more, *Christ* and his Apostles, beside the
 Holy Men before *Christ's* Incarnation, as-
 sure us so abundantly of the Truth of that
 Doctrine : insomuch that unless we allege
 this Proposition, *The Dead shall be raised*
with the very same Bodys, that they had be-
fore in this Life (Reply pag. 201.) to be an
 Article of Faith as it stands for the Sense
 of this Proposition, *The Dead shall rise*, we
 cannot believe the Article of the Resurrecti-
 on to be true in a Sense wherein we are
 oblig'd to believe it to be true, for the
 Sense of it and of those Texts which e-
 vince

vince it, as I have shewn above, absolutely requires that the Resurrection of the Body, should signify the Resurrection of the same Body, and whoever cannot believe it to be true in that Sense in which he is oblig'd to believe it to be true, cannot be said to believe it : else the *Macedonians* and many of the *Arians*, &c. as fairly believ'd the Eternity of the Son of God, as e'er an *Athanasius*, an *Eustathius*, a *Hosius*, or a Pope *Julius* of 'em all. To assert that which is repugnant to the most obvious Meaning of an Article of Faith is at least *virtually* to deny that Article, but not to assent to any supposition without which the primary Sense of the Article is incomplete, is, I think, somewhat more. And after all Mr. L. leaves me at a loss for a Reason why he shou'd so eagerly contend that we are not oblig'd to believe the Identity of the Body at the Resurrection. He confesses himself (*Reply pag. 195.*) that he does by no means deny that the same Bodys shall be raised at the last Day, yet he sees nothing his Adversary has said to prove it an Article of Faith. What his Adversary has said I do not concern my self to examin. But if the Resurrection of the Body understood *rightly*, and according to the known Rules of Acceptation, is all one with the Resurrection of the same Body, 'tis plain he that

that does not assent to the latter, whatever he denys, does not assent to the former, and I'm afraid, not Assenting to an Article of Faith will denominate a Man much the same as flatly Denying it. But if Mr. L. *does by no means deny that the same Bodies shall be raised at the last day*, why is he not at least content to leave that Position which he denys to be an Article of Faith, as a Position of an indifferent Nature? Why would he make out the Position it self to be Indefensible? For he that does by no means deny a Proposition, 'tis presumable allows it to be defensible: as on t'other hand he that offers Arguments to prove a Proposition indefensible, does, in some measure however, deny it. Imposing a new and uncommon Sense upon an Article of Faith is a thing of most dangerous Consequence, and 'tis not to be suffer'd that Old Interpretations which the Body of the *Christian Church* has ever receiv'd not only as true but necessary, shou'd give place to new Curiosities of private Men which themselves pretend not to maintain as necessary, nay the contrary to which *they do by no means deny*. If Mr. L. had suppress'd what he has publish'd against the Sameness of the Body at the Resurrection, no harm been done by his own Confession: but what mischief might follow from the Publication,

lication, a Man of a much Inferiour Understanding could not but discern, if it were but in this regard, that shifting Expositions of Faith distracts and unsettles Men's Minds, and weakens the Credit and Authority of Religion, especially of the *Christian* Religion, which being *that Rock* mention'd by the great Author of it *Matth. 16. 18.* appears then most like it self when thro' all the Parts, even the most minute, it is found compact and entire, without Alteration, Diminution or Addition. Nor is the Suffrage of Antiquity and General Reception, which Mr. *Lock's* learn'd Adversary has brandish'd against him, a Topick so easily diverted as Mr. *L.* seems to imagin, (*pag. 202.*) where he thinks it enough to reply, that *what the Christian Church has always understood is beyond his Knowledge.* Will it follow therefore that their Expositions are not better than his? or that his Knowledge is beyond theirs? Whether he thought it an Article of Faith or not, *That the same Body which was laid in the Grave should be raised at the last day,* undoubtedly he ought to have pay'd a greater Deference to the Catholick Church and to the Learning of his Adversary who admonished him of her Judgment, than arbitrarily to wave the first, and treat the latter with Expressions of Neglect.

Neglect. Notwithstanding I shall beg his Excuse and lay before you, Sr. a few Testimonies of the Ancients, part of whom having convers'd with and been train'd up under the Apostles, and all having liv'd at a far less Distance of time from the Preaching of *Christ* and his Apostles, than Mr. L. not to mention the Simplicity of the Ages they lived in, and a thousand other Advantages which they cou'd not but have over any Man now alive, however Mr. L. may think some of 'em came short of himself in point of Penetration, they will not only corroborate, but altogether confirm the Truth and Importance of the Doctrine of the Bodie's Identity at the Resurrection. I begin with *Clemens Romanus*, who thus advises the *Corinthians* in his First Epistle to them. §. 24. 25.

Κατανοήσωμεν, ἀγαπητοί, πῶς ὁ θεσπότης ἐπιδήκνυται διωκεῖς ἡμῖν τιῷ μέλλουσιν ἀνάστασιν ἔσεσθαι, ἥς ἢ ἀπαρχῇ ἐποιήσατο ἢ Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστηται. Ἰδούμεν, ἀγαπητοί, ἢ κατὰ καιρὸν γεννηθῆναι ἀνάστασιν· ἡμεῖς καὶ νῦν ἀνάστασιν ἡμῖν δηλοῦν κοιμῶμεθα ἢ νῦν ἀνίσταται ἡμεῖς, ἢ ἡμεῖς ἀπεισιν, νῦν ἐπέσχεται. Ἰδούμεν ποῦ καρπὸς· ὁ σπέρμα παρὰ δὴλόν τινα τρέπον γίνεται· Ἐξῆλθεν ὁ σπέρμα καὶ ἔβαλεν εἰς τιῷ γλῶσσι καὶ ἐληθέντων σπερμάτων, ἅπανα πέπλωκεν εἰς τιῷ γλῶσσι ἔσχατον καὶ θυμῶν, διαλύσι χερσίν· εἰτ' ἐκ τῆ διαχύσεως ἡ μεγάλη δύναμις τῆ περιτομῆς τοῦ θεοῦ ἀνίστασιν αὐτὰ, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ πλήρη αὐξάνει, καὶ ἐκφέρει καρπόν. Let us, my

D

Be-

Beloved, recollect what Pledges God affords us daily of a future Resurrection, the great Pledge and First Fruits whereof he has made Christ Jesus our Lord, in that he has raised him from the Dead. Let us, my Beloved, turn to those Resurrections which from time to time we behold in the Course of Nature. The Revolutions of the Day and Night are a lively Image of the Resurrection. The Night is as it were bury'd, the Day arises, the Day is lost and the Night re-enters. Turn we to the Fruits of the Earth. No Body can be a Stranger to the manner of the Growth of Corn. The Husbandman goes forth, scatters the Grain upon the Ground, which being of a dry and simple Nature is mollify'd and dissolv'd in Process of Time, and afterwards the stupendous Power of the Divine Providence raises it, and increases it, and it shoots forth Fruit in abundance. The latter of these Allusions is borrow'd from 1 Cor. 15. which I have consider'd already; the Former is plainly accommodated to our Purpose, for as Night being no more than the Absence of the Sun, the *Ratio formalis* of one Night is perfectly the same with that of another; so the new Day is nothing else than the very same individual Sun return'd which left our Horizon the Evening before. But the Holy Bishop proceeds. Ἰδωμεν τὸ παρόδον οὐ μᾶλλον, τὸ μνῆμα οὐ ἐν τοῖς ἀνατολικοῖς τόποις, τετίσιν τοῖς

τοῖς πλεὺς τῶν Ἀραβίαν ὄρνιθων γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ προσωνομαζέ-
 τω φοῖνιξ, τὸτο μονογενὲς ὑπάρχον ζῷ ἐτη πεντακόσια
 ἡμιόμιον τε ἦδη πρὸς ἀπόλυσιν τῷ ἀποθανεῖν αὐτῷ, ση-
 κὼν ἐαυτῷ ποιῆσαι ἐκ λιβάνου καὶ σμύρνης, καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἀρω-
 μάτων, οἷς ὃν πληρωθέντος τῷ χρόνῳ εἰσέρχεται, καὶ τε-
 λουτῷ· αποποιήσης ὅ τῷ σαρκὸς σκώληξ τις ἡσυχῇ,
 ὅς ἐκ τῆς ἰκμάδος τῷ τετελευτηκότῳ ζῷ ἀνατρεφόμενῳ
 πλεροῦν· ὅτα ἡσυχῇ ἡσόμενῳ αἰρεῖ τὸ σηκὸν ἐκείνον,
 ὅτε τὰ ὅσα τῷ προηρονότῳ ἐσὶν, καὶ ταῦτα βαράζων,
 διανύει ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀραβικῆς χώρας ἕως τῆς Αἰγύπτου εἰς τὴν
 λεγομένην Ἡλιόπολιν· καὶ ἡμεῖς βλεπόντων πάντων ὀπι-
 τὰς, ὅτι τὸ ἡλίεω βωμὸν τίθησιν αὐτὰ, καὶ ἕτως εἰς τυ-
 πίσω ἀφορμῇ. Οἱ δὲ ἱερεῖς ὀπισκίπουνται ταῖς ἀναγκα-
 ραῖς τῶν χρόνων, καὶ εὐείσκεισιν αὐτὸν πεντακοσιοστὴ ἔτος
 πεπληρωμὴν ἐληλυθένα.

*Let us meditate up-
 on that strange and surprizing Prodigy with
 which, 'tis said, the Eastern Parts of the
 World about Arabia are acquainted: There
 is a certain Bird call'd a Phœnix; there
 is never more than one of 'em at a time,
 and that lives Five Hundred Years, and when
 the time of its dying is at hand, it builds it
 self a Nest with Frankincense, and Myrrh, and
 other Aromaticks, into which it enters when
 its term of Life is compleat, and there dies.
 Afterwards the Flesh of it corrupts and breeds
 a Worm, which Worm is nourish'd out of the
 moisture of the dead Bird, 'till it is fledg'd:
 And when it is arriv'd to 'its full growth and
 vigour, it flies away with the Nest and 'its
 Predecessour's Bones in it, and carries it out*

of Arabia into Egypt, to the City of the Sun, and in open day in the sight of many Spectators, lays 'its Cargo upon the Altar of the Sun, and then returns into Arabia. And the Priests who preserve a Computation of the Time in Writing, find it constantly comes at the End of every Five Hundred Years. One wou'd conjecture the Father had especially design'd to answer Mr. L. So pertinent an Instance (no matter how fabulous or real) has he left us of an Animal restor'd to Life out of that very same Substance whereof it formerly consisted: 'tis true, the Bones of the former *Phœnix* remain in the Nest, but that is because the Relation supposes, that the new *Phœnix* without the matter of them becomes as compleat and large (*שוואו*) a Bird as the old, by the Nutrition it receives from the putrify'd Flesh of the old, which, be it as incredible as it will, upon the Parallel sufficiently shews St. Clement understood that our Bodies at the Resurrection shou'd consist of the same Particles that were laid in the Grave, and that no more of the Substance that was bury'd shou'd at the Resurrection of the Body be left behind, than what wou'd be more than necessary to make it at least as compleat, large, and substantial a Body as it was when first inhum'd, i. e. none at all. The Shepherd (of whom he had spoke

§. 1.) cautions St. Hermas Simil. 5. §. 7. in these words, *Andi ulterius. Corpus hoc tuum custodi mundum atq; purum; ut Spiritus ille, qui inhabitabit in eo, testimonium referat illi, et tecum fuisse judicetur: Atque etiam vide ne quando persuadeatur tibi interire corpus hoc, & abutaris eo in libidine aliqua.* Moreover, take care that thou keep that Body of thine pure and undefiled: that the Spirit which shall inhabit in it may give Testimony to it, and be known to have been united to it. And, be sure, let nothing induce thee to imagine that this thy Body shall utterly perish; neither upon any such Presumption do thou abuse it by yielding to its Lusts, where, as the *Interitus* he mentions cannot be the Separation of Soul and Body, for he makes it an *Interitus* of the Body only, and besides 'tis not supposable that *Hermas* shou'd be commanded not to look for a Natural Death, tho not to look for an Eternal Continuance of the Dissolv'd Body in a State of Dissolution: so the *Corpus hoc* can signify no other than that Body, of which it is declared that it shall not perpetually continue in such a State; i. e. of the Body which should be bury'd. The Blessed *Ignatius* in his Epistle to the Romans has in the Extasie of his Impatience for Martyrdom, express'd his Assurance of the Rising Bodie's Identity. *Aspete me dicens Ave spūa,*

δι' ὧν ἐστὶ θεῷ ἐπιτοχῶν· οἷός ἐμι τὸ θεῷ, καὶ δι' ὁδόν-
 των θηρίων ἀλήθομαι, ἵνα καθάρως ἄρτος θεῷ ἵσχυθῶ.
 μᾶλλον κολακεύσασθαι τὰ θηρία, ἵνα μοι τὰς θύρας
 καὶ μηδὲν καταλείψωσι τῶν τοῦ σώματος μου, ἵνα μὴ καίμη-
 θῆς βαρὺς τινὶ ὑπερδῆτομαι. O! do not stand in
 my way, but let the wild Beasts devour me, by
 means of whom I shall reach Christ. I am
 God's Grain to be ground between the Teeth
 of wild Beasts, that I may become the pure
 Bread of God. Rather invite and solicit the
 Beasts to rush upon me and entomb me, and to
 leave not even the least scrap of my Body, that
 being thus bury'd I may be found burthensome
 to no body. What was this Grain of God's?
 The very same that was to be ground be-
 tween the Teeth of wild Beasts, without
 any Deduction of the smallest Portion of
 it, to this End, that it (the very same still
 in Substance) might afterwards be found the
 Pure Bread of God, when the Parts of it
 shou'd be reunited into one Body at the
 last Day. From the Glorius Ignatius let
 us pass to Irenæus, who disputing against
 Valentinus and other Hereticks, that Ignorantes
 (as he says of 'em) *virtutem & promissionem Dei contradicunt suæ salutis*, thus
 expostulates, *Si autem Spiritus ejus qui suscitavit Jesum Christum à mortuis, vivificabit & mortalia corpora nostra, Quæ sunt ergo mortalia Corpora? nunquid nam animæ? sed incorruptabiles animæ quantum ad comparationem*

onem mortalium Corporum. Insufflauit enim in faciem Hominis Deus flatum vitæ, & factus est in animam viventem, flatus autem vitæ incorporealis est, sed ne mortalem quidem possunt dicere hominem ipsum flatu vitæ ejus existente. Sed neque Spiritum possunt dicere mortale Corpus. Quod igitur superest dicere mortale Corpus, nisi Plasma, id est, Caro, de qua & sermo est ei, quomodo vivificabit eam Deus? Hæc enim est quæ moritur & solvitur, sed non Anima neque Spiritus. Mori enim est vitalem amittere habilitatem, & sine spiramine in posterum, & inanimalem & immobilem fieri, & deperire in illa, ex quibus & initium Substantiæ habuit. Hoc autem neque animæ evenit, flatus est enim vitæ; neque Spiritui, incompressus est etenim & simplex Spiritus, qui resolvi non potest, & ipse vita est eorum qui percipiunt illum. Superest igitur ut circa carnem Mors ostendatur, quæ posteaquam exierit anima, sine spiratione & inanimale efficitur, & paulatim resolvitur in Terram ex qua sumpta est. Hæc igitur mortalis, hæc autem est de qua etiam dicit, vivificabit & mortalia corpora nostra. Et propter hoc ait de eâ in primâ ad Corinthios, sic & Resurrectio mortuorum, seminatur in Corruptione, surget in Incorruptionem. Etenim tu, ait, quod seminas non vivificatur, nisi prius moriatur. Quid est autem quod

ut granum tritici seminatur & patrit in Terrâ, nisi Corpora quæ in Terra ponuntur, in qua & semina jactantur: & propter hoc dicit seminatur in ignobilitate, surgit in gloria. Quid enim ignobilius carne mortuâ, vel quid iterum gloriosius surgente eâ, & percipiente Incorruptelam! seminatur in infirmitate, surgit in virtute: in infirmitate suâ, quoniam cum sit terra, in terram vadit: virtute autem Dei qui eam suscitât a mortuis. Seminatur corpus animale & surgit corpus spirituale: Indubitatè docuit quoniam neque de anima neque de Spiritu sermo est ei, sed de mortificatis Corporibus. Hæc sunt enim corpora animalia, id est, participantia animæ, quam cum amiserint, mortificantur. Deinde per Spiritum surgentia fiunt Corpora Spiritualia, uti per spiritum semper permanentem habeant vitam. As fully to the same intent and purpose Tertullian in his Disputation against the the Heresy of Marcion L. 5. Mortuorum Resurrectionem quomodo quidam tunc negarint prius dispiciendum est. Utique eodem modo quo & nunc. Siquidem semper Resurrectio Carnis negatur. Cæterum animam & sapientiam plures divinam vindicantes salvam reprobmittunt, & vulgus ipsum ea presumptione defunctos colit, qua animas eorum manere confidit. Cæterum corpora aut ignibus statim, aut feris, aut etiam diligentissime condita,

dita, temporibus tamen aboleri manifestum
 est. Si ergo Carnis Resurrectionem negantes
 Apostolus retundit, utique adversus illos
 tuetur, quod illi negabant, carnis scilicet
 Resurrectionem. Habes compendio respon-
 sum. Cætera jam ex abundanti : Nam &
 ipsum quod mortuorum Resurrectio dicitur,
 excigit defendi proprietates vocabulorum.
 Mortuorum itaque vocabulo non est nisi quod
 amisit animum, de cujus facultate vivebat
 Corpus est quod amittit animam, & amit-
 tendo fit mortuum ; ita mortui vocabulum
 corpori competit. Porro si resurrectio mor-
 tui est, mortuum autem non aliud est quam
 Corpus, Corporis erit resurrectio. Sic & re-
 surrectionis vocabulum non aliam rem vindi-
 cat quam quæ cecidit. Surgere enim potest
 dici & quod omnino non cecidit, quod semper
 retro jacuit. Resurgere autem non est nisi
 ejus quod cecidit. Iterum enim surgendo
 quia cecidit resurgere dicitur, Re enim Syl-
 laba iterationi semper adhibetur, ----- Quod
 de Terrâ est ibit in Terram. Hoc abit quod
 in Terram ibit, hoc resurgit quod cadit.
 To omit a great deal more which he adds ;
 and, as if all were not enough, he refers
 his Reader to his Book De Resurrectione
 Carnis, acquainting him that this is an
 Argument cui et alias quidem proprio volu-
 mine satisfecerat omnibus Hereticis resistens.
 What now will Mr. L. make of Irenæus's
 de-

defining the mortal Body spoken of by the Apostle to be no other than that *Psalm*, that structure of Flesh, that very, very same Flesh which after the Soul has taken its Flight, is dead, without all Breath or Motion, and rots away by piecemeal into that Earth from whence it was taken, but shall rise a Spiritual and Glorious Body according to St. Paul's Argumentation and Similitude, 1 Cor. 15. How will he persuade *Tertullian* to recant or qualify what he has so earnestly and so justly infer'd, *That if People will understand Words according to the Sense Mankind has impos'd upon 'em, by the Resurrection of the Dead, they must understand the Resurrection of that Body which had lost its Soul by which it liv'd: for that it is the Body that is left by the Soul, and thereupon becomes a Dead Body, and that therefore by the Word Dead is signify'd the Body, because if the Resurrection is to be the Resurrection of the Dead, and only the Body dies, the Resurrection is to be the Resurrection of the Body, so that the Word Resurrection is applicable to no other Substance (non aliam rem vindicat) than that which dy'd, inasmuch as that which always lay and never fell may rise, and Rising may then be affirm'd of it. But to rise again is only proper to that which fell, and that which fell, as it*
was

was taken out of the Earth, so having return'd to it shall rise again, even that very Body which fell? These Expressions are clear and full, and not to be perverted, such as it was necessary to use against those Hereticks whom *Irenaeus* and *Tertullian* had to manage. By the Way, if these Two Venerable Fathers have pronounc'd Mr. *Lock* a Child of *Valentinus*, of *Cerdon* and *Marcion*, and the like, I hope he will not be angry with me, I have been oblig'd to summon their Authority; and if their Sentence, and their Interpretations are found riveted together, I cannot help it. In this *Apologet* we learn the same Doctrine from *Tertullian* again, *Ubicunque resolutus fueris, quaecunque te materia destruxerit, hauserit, aboleverit, in nihilum prodegerit, reddet te.* Wherever the Parts of thy Body shall be dissolv'd, whatever parcel of Matter has destroyed thee, absorpt thee, consum'd thee, it shall give thee back again. Thus also *Minucius Felix*, *Tu perire & Deo credis, siquid oculis nostris hebetibus subtrahitur? Corpus omne sive arefcit in pulverem, sive in humorem solvitur, vel in cinerem comprimitur, vel in nidorem tenuatur, subducitur nobis, sed Deo, Elementorum Custodi, reservatur.* Can you fancy God loses sight of those Particles that are lost to our Eyes? Alas! every

every Body, whether it crumbles into Powder, or flows into Moisture, or is reduced into an Heap of Ashes, or Melts away in Grease and Oyl, leaves us in the Dark; but nevertheless, God the great Treasurer of the Elements has it in keeping. So the Apostolick Constitutions, L. 5. cap. 7. *καὶ τὸ*

πᾶν τὸ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ κατασκευασμένον, καὶ ἐν γῇ διασπαρμένον, καὶ ἐν ὕδατι διαλυμένον, ἀναστήσει ἡμᾶς σὺν αὐτῷ. Whether we are bury'd

at the bottom of the Ocean, or the Particles of our Bodies dispers'd to the four Cardinal Points, or the Beasts of the Forest, or the Fowls of the Air have torn us to Pieces and devour'd us, God by his Power will raise us up again, and *καὶ οὕτως ἡμεῖς τὰ διαλυμένα σώματα ἀνορθώσονται σὺν αὐτῷ.* *καὶ οὕτως ἡμεῖς τὰ ἐν γῇ διασπαρμένα, καὶ ἐν ὕδατι διαλυμένα, ἐξείσονται ἡμᾶς σὺν αὐτῷ.* Christ will reunite the Bodies that have suffer'd a Dissolution to their living Souls, for the Resurrection is to be of Bodies that were bury'd, not of any new Substance in lieu of what was bury'd. Beside these I might cite a multitude of Testimonies out of Justin Martyr, the *Questiones et Responsiones ad Orthodoxos* ascrib'd to him, Origen, Athenagoras, &c. but that I conceive, those already produc'd are sufficient to shew the Sentiments of the Primitive Church upon the Point debated, and the Authority of latter Ages being inferior to that of the Earliest, I hold my

self

self excus'd from further pursuing the Ar-
 gument from Authority, for more of which,
 if more will be acceptable, I refer you, Sir,
 to *Tertullians* Book *De Resurrectione Carnis*,
 and *Athenagoras* *περὶ ἀναστάσεως τῶν νεκρῶν*. Now
 what shall we say to all this? Shall we ac-
 quiesce implicitly in Mr. *Lock's* Assertion
 that it is not necessary to believe that the
 same Body shall rise again at the last day?
 or be guided by the Fathers, who have ac-
 counted them Hereticks as denying a neces-
 sary point of Faith, who deny'd the Identi-
 ty of the Body at the Resurrection? Shall
 we receive their Expositions of Scripture,
 the business of whose Profession, and the
 utmost of whose Ambition it was to under-
 stand the Scriptures perfectly, and who
 had many Privileges and Advantages in
 order to it which no body now can have?
 or shall we receive Mr. *Lock's*, the business of
 whose Profession it certainly is not, how
 much soever his Ambition may lie that way,
 living so late, and in an Age, God knows,
 so much abounding with Errors, and that too,
 when he is violating his own Rules, and
 breaking in upon that Analogy between
 the Names and Ideas of Things, which
 in his *Essay of Human Understanding* he
 makes so necessary a Condition of Reason-
 ing Rightly and Fairly? But to desist: I
 hope I have now discharg'd the Province
 you

you oblig'd me to undertake, and then I value not the Censures of those who find nothing more to except against but meerly my Undertaking it. Provided I have evinc'd all that was necessary to be evinc'd upon the Question propos'd, and answer'd all that requir'd an Answer, I know no reason why any *Criticks* shou'd look in my Mouth to examin my Age. *Amicus Quadragenarius, Amicus Sexagenarius, sed magis amica Veritas.* The Books containing those dangerous Mistakes which I have been now discovering and confuting, were not very lately publish'd, and tho' the Infection spreads apace, no abler Pen has attempted to stop its Career; Who knows therefore but God who is often pleas'd out of the Mouths of Babes and Sucklings to ordain Strength, may give the foregoing Pages an Efficacy at least, toward the preventing their further Progress?

However, if I reap no other Satisfaction, I am secure of the Pleasure accompanying my good Intentions to serve the Publick, and approve my self,

Sir

Your, &c.

August the
25th 1700.

O F

O F A

Cerberus Common-Wealth.

LETTER II.

Sir,

I Have read over, as you enjoyn'd me, the Second of the *Two Treatises of Government* father'd upon Mr. Lock, and certainly no *History of Monsters* can be more Entertaining. But no Body besides himself shall persuade me, Mr. Lock was the Author. The World has censur'd that Gentleman's Opinions with a great deal of Freedom; I need not say how justly: But I never heard his Parts call'd in Question. He is every where acknowledg'd an Acute and Ingenious Writer, so that I cannot bring my self to believe such gross and staring Contradictions, such manifest and wild Absurdities might flow from his Pen. Not to mention to you in how many Instances the Author of these *Two Treatises* has violated the Rules of all *Logic*

gick, we must either believe him not to be *Mr. Lock*, or that *Mr. Lock* has already forgot his own *Logick*; as particularly when in his Second Chapter of his first Treatise (concerning the Contents whereof, we settled our Notions when we were last together) he has been Expostulating two whole Pages out with his Adversary upon his having never defin'd his *Fatherly Authority*, he Subjoins immediately a long Paragraph, wherein are enumerated the Several constituent Properties of the Thing to be defin'd, as he has in order collected 'em out of Sir *Robert Filmer's* Discourses, whereas *Mr. Lock* in his *Essay of Human Understanding* teaches, that such Enumerations are the very best *Definitions*. Besides, as it had been unworthy a Philosopher to disappoint his adversary at the peril of his own Principles; so had it been unbecoming a Gentleman at the same time to enter a *Caveat* against *Cavilling* and *Railing* (See *Preface to the Two Treatises*) and to use Sir *Robert*, a dead Adversary, as that Authour himself Observes, so disingenuously and opprobriously, that whoever is unacquainted with Sir *Robert's* Character, might imagine him to have been some portentous Composition of *Bedlam* and *Billingsgate*. I hope *Mr. Lock* is a person of more Humanity and Breeding, than to cast upon so calm

calm and candid a Writer as Sr. Robert so many false and Seandalous Imputations, representing him as a popular Advocate for Slavery, a Sounder-forth of Glib Nonsense (Pref.) the Author of a Book which was to provide chains for Mankind (Chap. 1.) who according to his usual Method begins in one Sense, and concludes in another (Chap. 4.) tho' in his Eleventh Chapter he makes Sr. Robert a very great Master of Language and Stile (§. 100.) but yet he soon retracts, for in the 127th Sect. he exposes the Slave, as he is pleas'd very civilly to stile Sr. Robert (Chap. 5. §. 51.) as having made ridiculous Assignments (Chap. 11. §. 127.) serves him (§. 137. Chap. 11.) with a *Risum teneatis*, and which is the profoundest Paradox of all, insinuates (§. 196. the same Chapter) as if the Slave which in despite to the contrary Opinion of all other Ages and Countrys in the World but his own, had asserted Monarchy to be *Jure Divino* (Chap. 1. §. 4.) like a Zealous Christian Politician (Chap. 11. §. 154.) declin'd to allow God to have any care of his People. Does all this, think you, Sir, and as much more to the same Effect, favour of true Ideas, Reflexion and Philosophy? The Gossiping World may report what it will, but it shall never persuade me that a Man of Mr. Lock's Understanding and Letters could discharge such a Load of Incoherent Unaccountable Scurrility. E You

gick, we must either believe him not to be Mr. Lock, or that Mr. Lock has already forgot his own *Logick*; as particularly when in his Second Chapter of his first Treatise (concerning the Contents whereof, we settled our Notions when we were last together) he has been Expostulating two whole Pages out with his Adversary upon his having never defin'd his *Fatherly Authority*, he Subjoins immediately a long Paragraph, wherein are enumerated the Several constituent Properties of the Thing to be defin'd, as he has in order collected 'em out of Sir Robert Filmer's Discourses, whereas Mr. Lock in his *Essay of Human Understanding* teaches, that such Enumerations are the very best *Disinitions*. Besides, as it had been unworthy a Philosopher to disappoint his adversary at the peril of his own Principles; so had it been unbecoming a Gentleman at the same time to enter a *Caveat* against *Cavilling* and *Railing* (See *Preface to the Two Treatises*) and to use Sir Robert, a dead Adversary, as that Authour himself Observes, so disingenuously and opprobriously, that whoever is unacquainted with Sir Robert's Character, might imagine him to have been some portentous Composition of *Bedlam* and *Billinggate*. I hope Mr. Lock is a person of more Humanity and Breeding, than to cast upon so calm

calm and candid a Writer as Sr. Robert so many false and Seandalous Imputations, representing him as a popular Advocate for Slavery, a Sounder-forth of Glib Nonsense (Pref.) the Author of a Book which was to provide chains for Mankind (Chap. 1.) who according to his usual Method begins in one Sense, and concludes in another (Chap. 4.) tho' in his Eleventh Chapter he makes Sr. Robert a very great Master of Language and Stile (§. 100.) but yet he soon retracts, for in the 127th Sect. he exposes the Slave, as he is pleas'd very civilly to stile Sr. Robert (Chap. 5. §. 51.) as having made ridiculous Assignments (Chap. 11. §. 127.) serves him (§. 137. Chap. 11.) with a *Risum teneatis*, and which is the profoundest Paradox of all, insinuates (§. 196. the same Chapter) as if the Slave which in despite to the contrary Opinion of all other Ages and Countrys in the World but his own, had asserted Monarchy to be *Jure Divino* (Chap. 1. §. 4.) like a Zealous Christian Politician (Chap. 11. §. 154.) declin'd to allow God to have any care of his People. Does all this, think you, Sir, and as much more to the same Effect, favour of true Ideas, Reflexion and Philosophy? The Gossiping World may report what it will, but it shall never persuade me that a Man of Mr. Lock's Understanding and Letters could discharge such a Load of Incoherent Unaccountable Scurrility. E You

You challenge your Friend to confute the Positions maintain'd in the Second of those Treatises. At present, were I so disposed, I am embarqu'd in other Concerns, and cannot disengage my self. However you shall have my Thoughts in relation to the *Thirteenth Chapter*, because you press me so earnestly to digest it, and because, in good truth, to confute that Chapter is to break the Politician all at once, as indeed to transcribe the Chapter is to confute it. For in that single Chapter we find this mortal Enemy to a *Natural Sovereign Power*, Setting up no fewer than Three Sovereign Powers in the Same Community, and, which is pleasanter yet, all of 'em in Subordination to one another. Take his own words. *In a constituted Common wealth acting for the preservation of the Community, there can be but one Supreme Power, which is the Legislative, to which all the rest are and must be Subordinate.* There you have one supreme Power. Now in the next line for another. *The Legislative being only a Fiduciary Power to act for certain Ends, there remains still in the People a Supreme Power to remove or alter the Legislative, when they find the Legislative act contrary to the Trust repos'd in them,* I suppose by way of a Fourth Degree of Comparison, the Legislative Power is Supreme, but the Power of the

Mul.

Multitude Supremeſt. Well! but the *Legiſlative is the Supreme Power while the Government ſubſiſts*, §. 150. whereas the *Supreme Power of the Community can never take place till the Government's diſſolv'd*, §. 159. that is, the *Supreme Power cannot take place till there can be no Supreme Power*; for where all the Members of a Commonwealth are by Nature, as our Politician maintains, in a State of Equality, and the *Power which they gave, devolves into their Hands*, *Ibid.* 'tis the very Quinteſſence of Contradiſtion to affirm that the *Supreme Power of the Community* conſiſts in an *Universal Equality*. But for all this, *Legiſlative*, hold up thy Head; 'tis thy turn in the next Line to come uppermoſt. Since the *Legiſlative is no otherwiſe Legiſlative of the Society* (I wiſh our Author had afforded us a Marginal Note to explain what he meant by being *Legiſlative of a Society*) but by the right it has to make Laws for all the Parts and every Member of the Society, preſcribing Rules to their Actions, and giving Power of Execution where they are tranſgreſs'd, the *Legiſlative muſt needs be the Supreme*, and all other Powers in any Members or Parts of the Society, deriv'd from and ſubordinate to it. But now again make room, *Legiſlative*, and enter *Supreme Executive Power*, §. 152. *veſted in one, who having a Share in the Le-*

gislative, has no distinct Superiour Legislative to be subordinate and accountable to, farther than he himself shall joyn and consent, so that he is no more subordinate than he himself shall think fit. And §. 153. It is not necessary, no, nor so much as convenient, that the Legislative should be always in being; but absolutely necessary that the Executive Power should, because there is not always need of new Laws to be made, but always need of the Execution of the Laws that are made, as though, by the way, any Person or Persons were so well qualified to execute the Laws as those that could best understand the Meaning and Purport of them; or any cou'd understand the Meaning and Purport of them, so well as the Legislatours themselves; not to particularize that vast Variety of Cases and Circumstances, which will as perpetually and as necessarily require Alterations, or at least Restrictions and Constructions of Law equivalent to them, as the very Execution of the Laws. But now, to the right about as ye were. The Federative and Executive Power are both Ministerial and Subordinate to the Legislative, which as has been shew'd, in a constituted Commonwealth is the Supreme. Ibid. And agen, The Power of Assembling and Dismissing the Legislative, placed in the Executive, gives not the Executive a Superiority over it, but is a Fiduciary Trust

Trust plac'd in him for the safety of the People, in a Case where the Uncertainty and Variable-ness of Human Affairs could not bear a steady fix'd Rule. §. 156. Uncertainty of Human Affairs indeed! when that proud Executive Power which so lately pearch'd upon the highest Pinnacle of the State is now fetch'd down below not only the Supreme Legislative, but the Supreme Power of the People too. And after all (as one might easily have foreseen) 'tis their Supreme Power that sweeps away the Stakes, for The Constitution of the Legislative is the Original and supreme Act of the Society, antecedent to all Positive Laws in it, depends wholly on the People, and no inferiour Power can alter it, §. 157. And for a Conclusion of the whole Essay, The Supreme Legislative Power upon the Forfeiture of the Rulers, or at the Determination of a Time set, reverts to the Society, and the People have a right to act as Supreme, (that is, when such a Thing as an Inferiour no longer exists, in respect of whom the People might act as Supreme) and continue the Legislative in themselves, or place it in a new Form, or new hands, as they think good, although, I remember our Author had told us, §. 89. That wherever any number of Men, are so united into one Society, as to quit every one his Executive Power of the Law of Nature, and to resign it to the Publick, there and there

only is a Polirical or Civil Society. And that this is done wherever any number of Men, in the state of Nature, enter into Society to make one People, one Body Politick under one Supreme Government. Tabor and Pipe ne'r made such Melody. Nothing like Civil Society 'till Numbers of Men combine to make one Body Politick under one Supreme Government, tho the People, if they think good, may have a Right themselves to act as Supreme, to be their own Legislators. And this very Repugnancy is the Casting-card of our Authour's Accumulated Argumentations! The Wonderful Result of *Two Hundred Forty Three Sections! Parturiunt Montes-----* Now can you have the Conscience to desire me, Sir, to digest such crude and nauseous Inconsistencies as these? Certainly you beleive I have a most extraordinary Concoction! *Ovid's Metamorphoses* and *Popish Legends* might as soon go down with me. You may command me, Sir, in most matters; but should the Pope in *Cathedra* talk at this rate, 'twou'd startle, I dare say, the most credulous of his Adorers. *Transubstantiation* includes Contradictions good store, but then there are misapply'd Texts of Scripture, and Notions pretended from the Consideration of the Infinity of God's Power to veil their nakedness. Now our Politician's *Chimeras* come Gog-
ling

ling in Troops upon us! Three *Supreme Capacities* all on a row, stretching out their necks, and picking out one another's Eyes? But I take my leave of the *Cadmean Fraternity*, and hope by this time you are ready to do so too. Or if you cannot acquiesce, allow at least the Sincerity of,

Sir,

Your, &c.

August the
7th 1699.

O F

Sir William Temple's

Notion of the

Origin of Government.

LETTER III.

Sir,

I Return you many Thanks for the Present I lately received, particularly for Sir *William Temple's* Letters: and upon your *making the Motion*, have weigh'd the Meaning and the Consequences of what he offers concerning the Foundation of Civil Government, as I find his Thoughts publish'd in his *Miscellanies*. I readily agree with You as to the Elegance of the Stile and Propriety of the Expression; but the Doctrine appears to have a very dangerous Tendency, and I am not a little surpriz'd that no Body

dy has hitherto caution'd the World against the Reception of it. Suffer me therefore to impart my Sentiments thereupon, not that I wou'd seem to call in question the Judgment or Integrity of that Worthy Gentleman, whose admirable Performances both for Solidity and fine Language shall, I dare affirm, stand full proof against the mighty Cavils of a Thousand Criticks, who like *Æsop's* Crow must be trussing up Lambs, till they tangle their Claws in the Wool, a Calamity that constantly comes of finding fault with Masterpeices in the wrong place. Every Man of Prudence should beware how he draws upon a Brother of the Blade, a known Stager at his Weapon. He has but the Fortune of the first Pass to depend upon, and failing must be glad to crave Quarter not only from his Adversary, but from the Publick too. Notwithstanding when a just Occasion presents it self, though perhaps no Provocation design'd, the Laws of Honour and Gallantry oblige even your *Novices at the Exercise*, to venture at him, where he lies most open, but always upon fair and generous Terms. I do verily believe a Gentleman of Sense so profound as Sir *W.T.* had it never in his Thoughts to form such a Scheme of the Origin of Government, as ruins the very Notion of it; all that's to be said is, he
has

has been overseen in his own Art, and against the mischievous Influence of that Oversight in so great an Example, an Antidote cannot but be most necessary. I grant that excellent Author very strenuously asserts the necessity of Government in general and of Unity in the Governing Power ; for (says he P. 53. *Miscel.* 5th Edit.) *All Government is a restraint upon Liberty, and under all, the Dominion is equally absolute where it is in the last resort ;* And to the same effect, Pag. 49. *Every Man comes to find by Experience that Confusion and Popular Tumults have worse Effects upon Common Safety, than the rankest Tyranny.* And again, P. 80. *Authority can never be so great in many as in One.* His Reason for it I must afterwards consider. All which Declarations manifest sufficiently the fairness of his Meaning, and are Sentences worthy to be enregister'd in Tables of Gold. Each Proposition has the Force of an Edict, and interposing like the Poet's awful Patriot, *Virg. Æneid. l. v. 152.*

*When a distracted State has Tumults bred,
And Faction boils in each Plebeian Head,
When Stones fly thick around, Battoons and
Dirt,
And all that's hard or soft enough to hurt,
Profound Attention with a Look commands,
And the mad Concourse at a Breath disbands.*

*So much Address, and Character combin'd,
Avail to bend the Will, and Charm the Mind.*

But then such an untowardly Notion comes presently glancing upon these promising Principles, as utterly defeats their Force. For Custom and Opinion are at last made the *Ratio Formalis* of Government, in Conjunction with Authority arising from them. *Nor can it be (says he p. 53.) that when vast numbers of Men submit their Lives and Fortunes absolutely to the Will of one, it should be want of Heart, but must be Force of Custom or Opinion, the true Ground and Foundation of all Government, and that which subjects Power to Authority. For Power arising from Strength, is always in those that are governed, who are many. But Authority arising from Opinion is in those that govern, who are few. And P. 55. Authority arises from the Opinion of Wisdom, Goodness and Valour in the Persons who possess it. And what now wou'd any unbiass'd Judgment infer from these Positions? What I say, but that the Caprice and Good Pleasure of the Multitude all along gave birth to Human Order, and Discipline? That Rule and Majesty, the very Hinges of Human Society, have been ever the Donation of Muck-Worms? That Monarchs are Tenants at Will? Nay worse, at the Freak and Humour*

mour of the People? I willingly confess, in one Sense, Authority may pass for the Mother of Government, as that Authority resulted originally from a *Native* Right, as it is at this Day to be defin'd according to the Model of that Right, and as without the allowing and revering the Authority of that Right, the Nature of the Thing makes it impossible for Government to appear, or abide in the World. Animals might as soon move without Nerves and Muscles, as Governours manage Subjects that *securely* despise 'em. Admonitions and Persuasions are plainly thrown away upon such as have conceiv'd a mean Opinion of their Advisers. And what must they then expect who presume to dictate, oblige, compel, restrain and chastize, upon supposition the little Ones are prepar'd to piss upon 'em? That Exercise of Dominion which shielded and fortify'd by the Respect and Acquiescence of the Subject, holds all the Parts of a Common-wealth together, looks like committing Hostilities, and carrying on an Open War, when Subjects once come to playing upon Prerogative, and therefore the Pilots of the State may be glad in such a Juncture if they can but come off with bare Contempt, and 'scape Proscription and Arraignment. 'Tis an antiquated Lesson, that Authority's the Heart
and

and Vitals of Government ; an Assertion bordering upon Self-Evidence. Without the Efficacy of this, every School-master may as well burn his Birch, and nod out the Day in the Desk, as pretend to keep Peace among his Youngsters, or bring 'em to learn their Books. I make no doubt but *Dionysius* by the unluccky Fall he got from a Tyrant to a *School-master*, found all his Impressions and Influence much weaker than he would ha' done, had he rose to that Dignity from the Condition of an *Usher*. Nay for any thing I know, he might fall much lower upon the first Day of his brandishing the *Ferula*, than upon the Day of his quitting the *Scepter*. O! the archness of the young Villains, I warrant you !

" Well ! crys one, I say let's make a Bargain, and if *his Majesty* goes to lash us, " take him and strip him of his Royal Jurisdiction. And Liberty and Property, " say I (presently answers another) depose *Master Di* ; and he shake his Tyrannical Fist over me, I shou'd go near to " let him know I am a tight *Sicilian* every " Inch of me. For a Magistrate to Publish his Edicts, and make a Noise with, *We will and require at your utmost Peril-----* what is't, if his Authority be out of the way, but calling the Mob about his Ears, and laying Commands upon the Tyde till
it

it overwhelms him? No Body therefore will deny Sir *W.* the expediency of Authority in this respect. Every *School-Dame* knows it, and he must be very unfit either to rule, or to be rul'd, that is, to have a Being among Men who pretends to scruple it, but we can upon no Considerations yield him, that the true Genuine Original Authority which is the Foundation of Government, arises merely from Custom and Opinion; for Custom and Opinion are two of the most unsteady things in the World, and if Government must walk upon such Legs, a *Silenus* mounted were in a much better plight. When the Maggot bites, there's a full End of Authority, and without Authority we may go whistle for Government; because let Government be measur'd by Authority, and Authority by Mode and Opinion; and it follows unavoidably that Fashion and Fancy are to be the Rule and Standard of Government, and Seditious and Turbulent Spirits, all that will not receive them for such. Besides our Author shou'd have vouchsaf'd us a clearer account of his Authority; whether he meant by it a precarious Accidental Thing, or such a Title as is defin'd by the Law of Nature, and inherent according to such and such an Extent *only* in such and such Persons. Indeed p.60. he
thus

thus delivers himself, *From this Principle, and from the Discovery of some Natural Authority, may perhaps be deduced a truer Original of all Governments among Men, than from any Contracts, -----* in which words as he seems to disclaim the Supposition of Original Contracts; so he whispers a Word, but so softly that I can scarce hear him, in favour of Natural Authority, *from the discovery of some Natural Authority.* But still his own Principle of *Opinionative Authority* bears away the Bell; and garnish'd with a few *Spangles* of the Natural may put *Contract* out of Countenance, Not but he's ready to own, that *Governments founded upon Contract may have succeeded those founded upon Authority, and that the Ground upon which all Government stands, is the Consent of the People or the greatest part of them.* However that we may do Justice to this Gentleman who so fairly deserves it, we shall produce an Illustration of his meaning from himself. We must needs conclude (P. 65.) *that the Children of this Man (whom he has describ'd before) cannot fail of being bred up with a great Opinion of his Wisdom, his Goodness, his Valour, and his Piety, and if They see constant plenty in the Family, they believe well of his Fortune too. And from all this must naturally arise a great Paternal Authority, which disposes his*
Chil-

Children (at least 'till the Age when They grow Fathers themselves) to believe what he teaches to follow what he advises, and obey what he commands. Thus the Father by a Natural Right as well as Authority, becomes a Governour. It seems then he claims by a Natural Right. But what kind of one? e'en that which flows from Authority, as Authority from Opinion, (there you have all the Some Natural Authority at once) whereas in Good Truth Authority ought to spring from Natural Right, and Opinion owe it self to Authority. The Reverse is a meer Slip-knot, and untys in the touching, for if Opinion creates Authority, then 'tis to be imagin'd there was no such Thing as a previous Authority to beget Opinion; and yet which way Opinion shou'd arise, unless first excited by a Sense of those Qualifications which make up Authority, I can by no means apprehend; No, nor how an Authority compounded of those Qualifications, either conveys or enhaunces a Natural Right, which in truth upon such Terms is neither of a larger or smaller Extent, nor of a longer or shorter Continuance, than as the Qualifications themselves are more or fewer, improve or fail, excel or are excell'd: But at the same time I discern, without any Difficulty, that these Qualifications highly recommend and adorn

dorn an Antecedent Right, and have moreover good Grounds to expect, that the Divine Providence which by the Constitution of Things has made it necessary that some few Persons shou'd inherit so very advantageous a *Character* above others, will withal consult for the Happiness and Safety of those under Subjection, as by other Methods, so particularly by endowing the Superintendents with larger Capacities than ordinary, moulding their Dispositions to a peculiar Complexion, and working up their Passions and Inclinations by a singular Effort. So much, I say, we may reasonably hope, but then if those Hopes meet with a Disappointment, I'm sure no Conclusions ought to be drawn from that Repulse, to the Prejudice of a Native Title, notwithstanding that which Sir W. in the Instance of Paternal Power advances, that *if the Father of our Family govern it with Prudence, Goodness, and Success; and his eldest Son appear Heir to the Virtues and Worth of his Father, he succeeds in the Government by a natural Right* (resulting, you must believe, from those Virtues and that Worth, for I can find no other Natural Right intimated throughout his Essay) *and by the Strength of an Authority both deriv'd from his Father, and acquir'd by his own Personal Qualities: but if*

F either

either the eldest Son by Qualities degenerate and ill, happen to lose all Trust and Opinion, and thereby (Authority) in the Family; or else to die before his time, and leave a Child in his room; when the Father comes to fail, then the Children fall into Councils of Election, and either prefer the eldest of the Sons then living, or perhaps one later, and so remoter in birth, according as he may have acquir'd Authority by those Qualities which naturally produce it, and promise the best Conduct and Protection to the common Affairs of the Family. Where the Father comes to lose his Authority, many of the elder or wiser, or braver of the Sons increase in theirs by the same Degree; and when both these arrive at a certain height, the Nature of the Government is ready for a change; and upon the Father's death or general defection of the Family, they succeed in his Authority, &c. p. 74, 75. So that the good Qualities of the Father declining, 'tis but natural for him to lose his Authority among his Children, and consequently to forfeit his Right of Government depending upon that Authority; and the Father failing or coming to be depos'd, his eldest Son must be overlook'd, unless he prove Heir apparent to all the old Gentleman's Virtues and Merit. The exact Counterpart of his Progenitors he must be, if he means to reign after 'em, for who

knows

knows how small a disparity may null his Claim? At this rate of reckoning if honest *Perkin* were not of the House of *York*, he was as good, for *Perkin* had Courage, Sagacity, and Gallantry enough for a Duke *Richard*, nay, and the Right Features too. I do not mean this opprobriously, but only endeavour to expose the absurdity of the Mistake. Sir *W.* must needs have seen through it, and rather than cast a Slur upon the Understanding and Designs of so deservedly eminent a Person, I am ready to tax the Booksellers or Correctors of the Press, and conclude they have omitted or inserted with an extravagant Liberty. For our Author, 'tis plain, was far enough from being a Stranger to the true Notion of Paternal Jurisdiction; He presumes it to have been the only Establishment in the Infancy of the World, and all other Forms deriv'd from it, and those of all to be the most natural and commodious which are most Simple and Uniform, and approach nearest to the eldest Constitution: He supposes, I say, that the greater the Deviations have been, the Worse; and that whenever they were brought about, Unworthy Instruments have compass'd 'em by Unjustifiable Means: But then he pitches upon so pernicious and groundless a *Theory*, as makes a meer Shadow of the same Paternal Au-

thority, delivers it up to the discretion of those it shou'd determine, ranges all sorts of Governments upon the same Line and Level, and in reality frustrates all force of Discipline, by Devolving it to the Humour and Wisdom of the Multitude, who are born with an Aversion to the very Name of it, being a kind of *Living Clacks*, as full of Noise and Tumult, and as veering as Those of a Cherry Garden, but ten thousand times more Destructive in their way than the *Jays* and *Magpies* that frequent it. Madness and Faction set 'em a *Spinning*, and when their *Modicum* of Brains turns addle, then they fall to cobling of *Church* and *State*, though perhaps not a Man of 'em knows how to spell either of those Words, and wou'd ne'er have mention'd 'em but in prospect of a *Booty*. 'Tis pitty, methinks, we shou'd exclude the Mastiffs, the Horses, and the Bulls from the Privileges of their Masters. Undoubtedly some in the *Four-footed Class* wou'd make the better Privy Counsellours of the Two, in as much as blind Instinct is directed by a natural Byass at least to the common Good of the Universe, and cannot help being subservient to the general Interest; but *All Will and No Wit*, is a Thousand Pests and Furies in One, and may wager it with Tempests, Inundations, Earthquakes, Hurricanes,

canes, and all the Outrages of the four Elements, for matter of Violence and Devastation. -----

The Post, as your Good Stars wou'd have it, is this Minute a setting out; otherwise your Patience had had a longer Tryal, and your Friend not so abruptly profess'd himself,

Sir,

Your, &c.

November the
28th 1699.

O F
CONVERSATION.

LETTER IV.

Sir,

You wonder, and not without reason, so Little has been publish'd upon so considerable a Subject as that of Conversation. The Argument certainly would be copious and might be reduc'd into a *Systematical* Method. But I presume, we expect the Sleight should come of it self: We look upon it as a common Consequence of Life, and make sure of learning the whole Mystery of Entercourse by *Rote*. This Confidence, no doubt, has balk'd or quash'd the Disquisitions of the Ingenious; not to mention the strange Diversity of Opinions in the World about it. Your *German* and *Muscovite* make Carowzing the Essence and Soul of Conversation: your *Frenchman* Cap'ring, your *Dutchman* Bargaining, your *Spaniard* Formality, your

En.

Englishman a mixture of all; your *Mathematician* *Circles* and *Squares*; your *Philosopher* *Substantial Forms*, *Vortices* and *Vacuums*; your *Lawyer* *Bills in Chancery*; your *Politician* *News-Letters* and *Votes*, &c. And how is it Possible to accommodate Rules and Maxims to such an infinite variety of Pretensions; If you espouse the Interest of This or That or T'other in opposition to the Rest, you mistake your Measures and your Argument: If you're for *Indulgence* and *Toleration*, you confound your whole Design, and bring the World back to *Babel-Colloquies*.

What's to be done then? How shall we contrive that our Rules of Conversation be neither too compendious nor too comprehensive? The best Expedient I can at present suggest is this, that the Differences of Dispositions and Occupations be well observ'd by all Parties, and that a concurrence in Purposes and Business be allow'd as the properest Foundation of Familiarity. This piece of Good Counsel you may deem Unnecessary, as if 'twere probable Men of the same Genius and Profession would not associate without my Persuasives. But under Favour, I believe 'twere to be wish'd the Posterity of *Adam* were as happily fort-ed as you imagin. For besides what the Proverb mentions of *Two of a Trade*, the

Methods and Conclusions of those who pursue the same Concerns and Studies, prove generally as distant as their Interests. Are they Proficients alike? One may not submit his Judgment to another forsooth! upon any Consideration: no, they must stand upon Ceremonies, Punctillios and Scruples as rigidly as *Embassadours*. Are they not alike Proficients? The Disparity is apt to beget Neglect on one side, and Envy on t'other. Yet still 'tis most probable they should best agree together who act in the same Sphere, and whose Improvements run in the same Chanel. 'Tis natural for 'em to chop upon the same Topicks of Discourse, they *charge* and *go off* in due order like a File of *Musketeers*, and *scate* along an Argument, as they could never tire. Not but we are often oblig'd to engage in other Company than such as wou'd best please us, or than we can best please. Nay we are oblig'd to do so of *Choice*. Our Relations and old Friends have reason to expect our Attendance; they must not be Articled with, and ty'd up to *Themes*. Indeed to except against any general Matters of Discourse they shall offer, betrays a narrowness of Understanding, as well as a want of good Humour and Breeding. 'Tis as much as to say, we are ignorant of those Particulars they
harp

harp upon, and *Pedantry* is the best Interpretation the Matter will bear. So that in short, if you would pass muster abroad, you must have a general Knowledge and Taste of Things; you must furnish out a little *Lab'ratory* in your Head, glean Occasional Intimations and Notions, and treasure up Materials for every Turn. What if a Professour of Medicine shou'd chance to have an old *Rich Tarpaulin* to his Uncle? Were it not a Thousand Pittys the Doctor shou'd lose the Golden Consequences of many a Good Voyage, for being a Stranger to *Starboard*, *Larboard*, and the rest of *Neptune's* Language? Agen, if a poor *Academick Secluse* follow'd his Nose till it led him into a Bower tenanted of *Young Ladys*, how must the Gentleman carry himself? Believe me, he would have less to say in his own Defence than if he had been Shipwreck'd upon the Coast of *Barbary*. He wou'd swear his Bedmaker had bewitch'd him into Regions remote, where the Philosophers had no Beards, and instead of *Breeches* wore *Silken Sacks with the Bottoms out*. Then for their Language, he wou'd not know what to make on't; nor they of his, if he once ventur'd to bespeak 'em *Categorically*. But to be serious, 'tis our best way to go a Progress round the Course of Things so soon as we can Copy, out Nature's

ture's Inventory, and Dip into every Volume of her Library. Thus we shall qualify our selves to bear a part in the general Commerce of Life ; we shall not be frighten'd and confounded at the Proposal of new Subjects to talk upon ; we shall insensibly refine and enlarge our Stock of Knowledge and Experience ; in a Word, our Conversation will become agreeable to every Body, and every Body's contribute to the making ours yet more so.

When I seem to recommend a general *Acquaintance with* and *Use* of Topicks of Discourse, do not imagin, Sir, I make no Exceptions. All Irreligious, Immoral and Unmannerly Subjects I utterly exclude: These must not reach into Contemplation, and much less into Conversation. They defeat the Principal Ends of it, and are not to be mention'd without Marks of Horror and Aversion. Air model'd into such Sounds becomes Pestilent, and must be *corrected* by Reproofs and Confutations. Nor shou'd we dwell upon Rustick, Vulgar, or Childish Topicks. Now and then a Casual *Dash* of 'em, like *Mint* in a *Sallad*, gives a Relish to better Things, and proves a suddain Relief to our Apprehensions when they have gaz'd long upon the same Object. Personal and Private Affairs ought only to be hinted in mixt Company: They
cramp

cramp very often an allowable Freedom, create Jealousies, make Strangers to them uneasy and useless Members, are generally barren, interrupt or prevent more significant Entertainments, and drop in just as seasonably as the Act about *Marriages, Births and Burials*. 'Tis ill meddling with *Censures and Characters*. A few jocosse Escapes of that kind may nevertheless be permitted without great Danger; especially if the Persons touch'd upon, be present to reply, and set the Raillery forward; else the Satyr may bear a Misconstruction. *Hard Words, Compliments and a Superfluity of Proverbs are Prohibited Commodities*, in Conjunction with *Repetitions*, unless when something Singular which has affected and tickled the Company, may be handsomly apply'd upon a new Occasion.

When Things of serious Concernment and an intricate Nature are to be discuss'd, let timely Notice be given. 'Tis by no means advisable, and often proves pernicious, to engage in Controversies without *Premeditation*. However it frequently so happens, that a forward Disputant sounds the Charge, and brings a Necessity upon the Company of standing to their *Arms*. At such a Juncture Religion and Honour must neither be dissembled nor deserted. To flinch from the Defence of These is really

ally an Affront to the Company instead of a Condescension and a Pleasure ; at least it shou'd appear such. The grand Interests of Human Kind suffer by our Silence, and the Fundamental Laws of Society are violated. Indignation and Satyr, Reason and Wit, all our Forces must be drawn out against these Insolences. 'Tis true, Superficial and Secondary Errors modestly asserted may claim a milder Management, but no Countenancing. He that lets his Friend run away with, or propagate a Mistake is unkind and unfaithful. Much better adjourn the Jollity of the Meeting than not rescue the Man I esteem from wrong Sentiments, unless when I have Reason to believe, 'twou'd turn to better Account if I took another Opportunity.

The Conversation of Women is generally undervalu'd. 'Tis call'd Effeminacy to seek it. The most important and substantial Purposes of Life are suppos'd to lie out of their way. We confine their Capacities and Attainments to Huswifry and Behaviour: at most we initiate 'em no farther into the Mysteries of Erudition than *Plays, Romances*, and by chance a *little History*: whether because knowing their natural Curiosity we employ 'em upon the Fringes of Learning, to divert their further penetration, for our own Ease and Security: or because

cause they might rival us so effectually in their Acquisitions, as to advance Claims and Titles to Precedency, settle the Duty of a Wife to her Husband upon *Original Contracts*, and infer *Adam's* Subjection to *Eve* from the *sweating of his Brows*----whether, I say, upon the former account or the latter we discourage the Ladys in the Point of Learning, I can't determine: but am sure there is a Readiness of Fancy, a Vivacity of Imagination, an Acuteness of Wit peculiar to that Sex, which Ours need not scorn nor blush to imitate. Their Images of Thought for the most part look lucky and natural. Elegances distill from 'em unawares. Their Observations and Maxims are more just and plausible, than if they had been tampering with their Faculties in the Schools of Philosophers. While their old Fathers, Uncles, or Husbands turn over their *Authors*, or their *Shop-Books*, they are at leisure to contemplate the World, form their Opinions of Things, and lay in a Stock of quaint Remarks. Or if they cannot make us Wiser, if they cannot enrich our Intellectuals, and prompt and dress up our Conceptions, they may teach us however a genteel Complacency and Easiness in Conversation. But this by the by.

To proceed. Conceited Coxcombs must upon no terms be listed. They murder the
Sa-

Satisfaction, and marr the Benefit of Converse ; for they alone are to dictate and determine, set *Perpetual Presidents*, controul the Fraternity, and carry the Cause by Force of Magisterial Forms and Motions. If an Acquaintance pretends to a stating of the Case before or after *Sir Positive*, he falls instantly under Correction, holds up his Hand at the Bar, and receives Sentence as a *Traitor* against the Sovereign Wisdom of *Solon the Second*, who claims a Priviledge to monopolize Politicks, and pass into an Oracle, tho scarce qualify'd, perhaps, for *Clark of the Committee*. But will not this sort of Creatures serve to give us Diversion? In earnest, they will not. Arrogance and Peremptoriness deserve our Commiseration, and are not ridiculous enough to make us merry. They give Qualms to Men of Understanding, grate upon the Senses, and are Objects more Offensive than the Cripples in *Lincolns-Inn-Fields*. If a Fool must be had for Diversion, commend me to a tractable One, a modest, unassuming *Zani*, that knows his proper Province, keeps within Bounds, and is better instructed than to exercise his Talent, unless in opportune Intervals, and *between Acts*.

Your Noisy Folk too may e'en walk off with your pretending Fops. Let 'em be as deep-sighted and knowing as they please, yet

yet if they grow too loud upon their Advantages, let 'em harangue at a Distance. The Company thank 'em for their Instructions, but wish they might purchase 'em *salvis auriculis*. Besides that these *Criers of the Court* might as well hold their hands upon our Mouths; for 'till Licence obtain'd from them, Men of Weaker Organs, be their Judgments as profound, and their Knowledge as extensive as you please, must either not speak, or not be heard. They may be as musical as *Syrens*, but the Melody's blown away in a Tempest. Will you begin a Sentence? Immediately your Man of Talk steps in between your Nominative Case and Verb, and snatches your meaning from you e'r you know it your self.

Add to these your *Critical Insects*, your Anatomizers of Words, and Menders of Propositions. A Man cannot utter a familiar Sentence, but an Inquisition of *Jackanapes* immediately sets upon't. If you make choice of the word *Distant*, O Fie, says the little *Distinguisher*, you mean *Remote* sure. If you bid him *Good Night*, he sleeps not for thinking you shou'd chance to miss of *Bon repòs*. Is an Author mention'd, or a Verse repeated? You're entertain'd with a ridiculous Dissertation two hours long, upon Imaginary Excellences or Imperfections: *This word shou'd have stood there, that very*
Syllable

Syllable is expressive, this Epithet is not so good as one as might have been, &c. Now when People can please themselves in trumping up such trivial Observations, the properest Apartment for 'em is the *Nursery*, where the *Cherry-stones*, *Marbles*, and *Cockalls* expect them. Their case is become desperate; They are no longer fit either for *Company* or *Solitude*.

But to what purpose do I mention any of these disagreeable Humours and Qualities which render a Man's Conversation Insignificant and Troublesome? They easily discover themselves, or if they did not, my Friend is better able to discern them than I. However, a little precautioning does no harm; the less, because 'tis both more creditable and more seasonable to decline an Acquaintance betimes, than to break it off when contracted. Indeed we cannot manage Our selves too circumspectly in the Choice of our Company, and in all the Circumstances of Conversation. As a Wise Man wou'd not be Unsociable, so neither wou'd he be too easily Accessible. As he wou'd wish to consort with those, under whose Influence he might improve himself; so he wou'd admit to Familiarity those who desire to improve themselves under His. As he wou'd single out Men of Probity, Parts, and Learning; so of that Number

he

he wou'd prefer Men of good Humour, Frankness and Gallantry. For such there are in the World, tho' not every where to be found. As to the Circumstances of Conversation, he will have a just regard to Place, Time, &c. Within the Walls of a Church he will talk *seriously* and *solemnly*: At Table *pleasantly*: Among Philosophers *rationaly* and *poinantly*: To Lawyers, *cautiously*: To Ladys, *humorously*. He will neither tye himself up so precisely to Hours of Business as upon no Emergencies whatever to dispence with a Period extraordinary for Conversation, nor yet so neglect the Distribution of his Time as not to assign to common Occasions their proper Proportions. To keep a Correspondence with the World is absolutely necessary: If Nature enforce'd it not, Immemorial Custom, and Universal Practice have long since made it Unavoidable. But I know of no Obligations upon us in regard of one or t'other, to let our *Time lie in common*, and to submit the Disposal on't to the next Comers. In brief, the Dutys of Religion, the business of Study, the Care of our Estate and Family shou'd be serv'd in the first place. The whole *Overplus* of Time 'tis our Duty to devote to *Conversation*: else *Melanchooly* or *Vice*, be assur'd, will engrois it. I am, Sir, your, &c.

May the 21st. 1700,

G

O F

OF
Government in General.

LETTER V.

Sir,

WHen we were sometime since accidentally Discoursing of the late Troubles in *Poland*, we fell into a Dispute about the Nature and Necessity of Civil Government ; and I remember, you stood boldly to't, that Government was no more than a Fortuitous, Prevailing Custom, and that large Societies of Men might fare as well, nay better, *without*, than *with* an absolute, supreme Power lodg'd amongst them. I thought I had at that time said enough to convince you of the Contrary ; but, it seems, I was mistaken : So that in pursuance of my Promise to you *then*, and in obedience to the Commands of your Last, I shall now resume the Argument in a Letter, and sine
you

you at least a *Groat* Postage for your Perverseness.

I think I have sufficiently digested all that was urg'd *Pro* and *Con*, and find myself more persuaded than ever, that without the Superintendency of Civil Powers, and a Governable Disposition in Subjects, no Sect nor Sex, no Body of Men nor Individual, can reap any Satisfaction of Life, enjoy any Privileges of Nature, or so much as hold a place in the System of Things; that 'tis as impossible for us to live *with*, as *without* one another, unless some obey some, while Neighbours help Neighbours; and that consequently all Parties who are really impatient for Anarchy, or patient under it, become a Pest to the Works of the Creation, and *disenfranchise*, nay *outlaw* themselves *ipso Facto*.

Now we cannot more certainly inform our selves of the Truth of these Matters, than by examining how many and what Relations are of Course compriz'd in the Notion of Government. It shou'd not content a Sober Man, that he has consulted variety of Authors upon the Point; that he can learnedly distinguish or confound the several Forms of Civil Establishment, and over the Fumes of *Coffee* dispel his own and his Country's *Hed-ach* at a setting. No, he must descend deep into himself, he

must have recourse to first Principles, and fixt Propositions, a Question of so great Importance deserving, and its Nature very easily admitting it, for since that Complex Idea which we have of Government is precarious, and of neither a larger or less Latitude than the Parties concern'd shall please to assign, so soon as both Parties have settled and defin'd the Meaning of their Terms, it will be no very difficult matter, provided they sincerely observe Preliminaries, to determine of the Equity of Conclusions. Now under the Notion of Government I conceive are couch'd three Personal Relations, the First that of a *Judge*, the Second that of a *Plaintiff*, the Third that of a *Defendant*. By a *Judge* I understand a Person empower'd to decide all Quarrels, to Punish Offenders, and in a Word to take such Methods as to him shall appear most proper both for preventing of Injuries and redressing them: By a *Plaintiff* not only a Person actually accusing and prosecuting the Defendant, but such an one as upon any occasion *may* do both: By a *Defendant*, not simply one holding up his Hand at the Bar, but whosoever under such a Judge may at any time be call'd in question by a Plaintiff. That there can be no such Thing as Government or a *Regulation of Affairs between Party and Party*, unless where these

Three

Three Relations are found, will appear most evidently, if we remember that as *Plaintiff* and *Defendant* are what the Logicians call *Relative* and *Correlative*, and so necessarily infer each other, so 'till a third Person comes forward to *compromise*, the two other remain in a meer State of Anarchy, the one having as much right to determine for himself as the other. A common Nature gives them equal Prerogatives, and tho perhaps their Faculties be disproportion'd ; tho one may boast the Advantage in Subtilty and Contrivance, the other in Robustness and Bulk of Body ; tho the stronger may be sensible of the badness of his Cause, and the weaker of the Goodness of his ; Yet each in his own Opinion being as well to pass as th' other , or at least when a contest arises seeming to have as clear or a clearer Title, the determination of the Controversy must of necessity be suspended, 'till such time as a Third Person interposes, which the Law of Nature requiring that all such disorders should be not only remedy'd, but by the most proper Means prevented, dictates to be sought with the utmost Expedition: and indeed on the same score, whereon she enacts that such Disputes when commenc'd should be thus made up by the Authority of a Third Person, as being the most effectual and ready

Means, does she also enact for the restraining and prevention of such Mischiefs, that a third Person shou'd antecedently to their Quarrel, preside over the Commerce and Conversation of any Two, that may sometime or other happen to contend. That absolute, unerring, infinite Wisdom which first compil'd and with due Sanctions confirm'd that Law, must be suppos'd to approve of those Courses, and those only which conduce most of all to the Preservation and Benefit of those Creatures whom that Law obliges. Indeed this very Proposition is a Material Clause of that Law, and we must either imagine the Author of our Being mistook himself when he decreed it us, and implanted in our Breasts an ambition to preserve our selves, or that he's perfectly unconcern'd for the Safety and Happiness of that, which he has thought worthy to exist, and to be capable of Happiness, unless we admit, that he expects the most commodious and speedy Methods shou'd be submitted to, for the Security and Relief of all Partys.

That therefore any Establishment cannot consist of Fewer Relations than Three, is sufficiently clear; but may it not comprehend more? Nay, where, except toward the Beginning of *Adam's* Reign (who, by the way, when only Himself and his Wife were

were upon Earth, was Sovereign Lord over *Eve*, and though *One Person*, might sustain the Relations of *Judge* and *Defendant*, it being altogether reasonable that *Adam* should determine her who must be suppos'd to have been inferiour to him in Point of Experience, Courage, Strength, and all Qualities and Qualifications whatsoever necessary to Government and Protection, notwithstanding the Objections advanc'd by the Author of the *Two Treatises of Government* against the Excellent Sir *R. Filmer*) where, I say, do we meet with that Constitution in the present World, or the Annals of the past, in which a whole Multitude is not collectively concern'd? I grant it, but notwithstanding maintain, that be the Members of the Common-Wealth never so many, the Number of their *Political Relations* cannot exceed that already mentioned. To make this Assertion clearer, suppose the Three Factions of *Cæsar*, *Pompey* and *Crassus* in the Field; let their Power or Pretensions be equal or unequal, as you please, 'tis certain that till the Differences of the Competitours are made up by the Sentence of some distinct Arbitrator, the several Members of each Faction continue in a State of mutual and profess'd Enmity. Every Souldier of *Cæsar* remains in a posture of Defiance and Opposition to

every Souldier of *Crassus* and *Pompey*, and so every Souldier of *Pompey* or *Crassus* in respect of *Cesar's* or one another's Men, the Inconveniences of which Divisions the Arbitration of a fourth Interest (perhaps the Senate's) may best accommodate. So soon therefore as the Senate, or a Majority in it (for the unanimity of a Body of Arbitrators, such as the Majority of the Senate, is all one with the Unity of an Arbitration in a single Judge) shall by a general Determination compose the Dissentions reigning between the several Factions, altho' the arbitration proceed in general Terms, and endless Repetitions be thereby avoided, yet every particular Person of the three Factions with respect to every individual, is as much concern'd in, and oblig'd by such a *general* determination, as if he and each of his Antagonists had been with the Dispute depending between them, expressly mention'd, and every such Individual and his Rival with him, from the Generals down to the Black-guard, whether personally known and consider'd by the Arbitratour or not, becomes equally Plaintiff and Defendant before him in a National Cause as if it were but a private one, and did not reach beyond their Particular Interests. To illustrate this, let *Claudius* and *Drusus* be two of *Cesar's* Soldiers, *Maximus* and *Gal-*

ba two of Pompey's, *Marcus* and *Decius* two of *Crassus*'s. That general comprehensive Arbitration of the Senate which compendiously reconciles the jarring Interests of the three Factions accommodates the personal Controversy, which on that account *Claudius* had with *Maximius*, *Maximus* with *Claudius*, *Decius* with *Drusus*, *Drusus* with *Galba*, *Marcus* with *Drusus*, *Maximus* with *Decius*, and so forth, each Antagonist having personally oppos'd his Adversary in a publick Cause. Nor is it a just Objection to what we have alledg'd before, that the deciding Authority may be seated in a Number of Men as well as in one single Person, the concurrent Determinations of a Majority being equivalent to the Voice of a single Judge. 'Tis true, far less Inconveniencies attend the latter than the former: 'Tis possible, and an hundred Instances have prov'd it more than so in Compound-ed Governments, that instead of a Couple or More to make a Majority, each Member of a Supreme Counsel, shou'd be but just one by himself, as singular in Opinion as in Person. How must we then get the Cause concluded? To which of them rather than to the rest shou'd we submit ourselves? Is there a Foreman among them that on such an Emergency has a Power to finish the Debate? That indeed may
much

much facilitate matters, if such a *Dictatorial* Power might obtain a free Course and a due Exercise. But then shou'd any Two of the Assembly have happen'd to concur, though mistaking one another's Sentiments, or perhaps not knowing them, tho they before seem'd to disagree, what becomes of Mr. President's Sentence? How many new Controversies about Liberties and Privileges must be started? and how many new Factions must those Controversies beget, and in fine with what Uncertainties and Irresolutions will not the Governours only be perplex'd upon the point under Consideration, but the Subject upon the point of Submission and Obedience; while either through Ignorance, Inclination, or Levity, one stickles for one Man's Interest, another for another's, and perhaps ne'er a one for the Right, nor, indeed in the Conclusion, e'er a Right to be for. Then the Bandileers begin to rattle, Authoritative Ermins make room for Military Buff, and the Cause must be carry'd by the Verdict of the *Scymeter*. A blessed way to compose things truly! and very promising! when twenty Pretenders must in vindication of the Rights of the Republick try their Fortunes each in Opposition to the other, and upon Motives equally justifiable, it being no less the Duty and Interest of one than of the other to as-

fert

fert his Authority, wherein he is persuaded it may be serviceable to his Country. But notwithstanding all these Difficulties, so long as a Majority can be found in such a Supream Judicature, that Majority both bears the Character, and challenges the Force of a single Arbitratour; for it promulges and interprets Laws as by one Mouth, and executes and maintains 'em as by one Arm.

It appears then that the Notion of Government includes the three Relations of Judge, Plaintiff and Defendant, as they have been above explain'd, these and no more. In the next place it may be proper to contemplate the Extent of this Judge's Authority; not but the Definition of him already given declares the Latitude of his Commission, or did it not, we might very easily from the Consideration of the Ends of his Office discover it. His Business we know, is to consult and provide for the Good of his Plaintiff and Defendant, to make up their Breaches, to protect which ever of 'em is abus'd, and to punish his Oppressor. As numberless are the Seeds of Contention between Man as *Epicurus's* Atoms, and almost as minute. A malignant *Genius* continually haunts Human Society, 'tis an indefatigable Fiend, improves the smallest Slips and Mistakes into the

the most fragrant Provocations, misrepresents the clearest Meanings, and poisons the very best. Upon this Foundation he still erects more magnificent Mischiefs, Obloquy, Contempt, and Malice in a thousand Forms, false Insinuations, Reproaches, Menacings, 'till at last the Work's crown'd with glorious Trophees of Rapine, Murder and Desolation. Besides this another *Demon* very nearly related to the former has taken up his dwelling too with Mankind, a special Friend, as he wou'd make you believe, to Unanimity and Good Offices, sustaining the Character of Pimp, and Setter for the Regions below, a dextrous Quick'ner of inordinate Desires; he heightens Gustos as skilfully as his Brother Animosities, ever seconds irregular Motions of the Blood, and jogs a Man's Elbow, when he's filling his Glass. Agen, when the Coin's gone after the Conscience (and it seldom stays long behind) the Diligent Spright either recommends his Purchase to the Care of his Colleague, or puts him in a way to reimburse himself out of Church Plate, Old Men's Chests, and Monuments, &c. To withstand the Progresses of these Pests is our Judge appointed, and Reformation of Manners as well as Prevention and Redress of Wrongs ought to be his daily care. Indeed the latter absolutely requires the former.

mer. Perhaps no Prosecutour may appear against a Libertine or an Atheist, too many believing the Practices of such do not Immediately concern Them. But yet since not only in regard of the terrible Judgments they may call down upon that Society where they are suffer'd, but of the Common Danger of the Example too, and because in the sight of profligate People all Crimes are equally heinous, so that whenever a safe opportunity invites, they may burst Coffers, corrupt Wives, debauch Daughters, cut Wind-pipes with as little Concern, as Whore, Drink, Blaspheme, commit Sacrilege, I say, since in regard of these Things not any one single Person of a Community, but indeed the Whole Body have for their own sakes, and as injur'd Persons, good Reason to turn Plaintiffs and prosecute all Libertines, Immortal Actions and apparent Impieties come also within the cognizance of this Judge, and call for a Regulation from him. Nor may he by vertue of his Judicial Authority assume a Right either of determining after his own Humour, or perpetrating what in his Plaintiff or Defendant he condemns. Nay, the greater his Abilities to injure, the stronger his Obligations to the Contrary, because the Consequences of his abusing his Power wou'd be so much the more pernicious.

The

The best Things once perverted become the worst; and the Monarch who makes a Sword of his Scepter, a Rule of his Appetite, and as bold with the Liberties and Fortunes of his Plaintiff and Defendant, as if they were his own, involves himself not only in the guilt of destroying those Rights and that security which he is oblig'd both to rescue from the Insolences of Invaders, and enlarge for a Reward to Persons Meriting, but at the same time too in the guilt of tempting and encouraging his Subjects to commit the same Outrages upon himself and upon one another, for as the Example of no Crime is so infectious as that of Injustice, so is no Example of Injustice half so contagious as that of Men in Power. Other Men's Possessions bring along with them others Men's Pleasures, a prospect of which is no less inviting to the Voluptuary than to the Miser, and on this account Injustice belongs to the Trade of ill Men of every kind. Dignity of Station implying both knowledge of Duty and amplitude of Fortune, it's no wonder that Inferiours so vehemently affect the Example of their Betters, and the Goods of their Neighbours. Of all Parties therefore this Judge has the least Liberty to make Incroachments, or set a bad Example of any Kind whatsoever. And 'tis a most excellent Observation,

servation, that of the *Roman Oratour*, (*De*
Legibus Lib. 3.) "It is my Opinion, says
 "he, that Commonwealths ever shape
 "their Humours and Practices to the Be-
 "haviour and Conversation of their leading
 "Men. Whence it follows, That every
 "such Society suffers a double Diskindness
 "from the Corruption of Princes, who in
 "truth scarce do so much mischief by their
 "personal Enormities among, as by the In-
 "fluence of their Example over their In-
 "feriours; nor can they ruine a Body Po-
 "litick half so effectually, by boldness of
 "Practice, as by badness of Precedent.
 Besides, it becomes the Legislatour much
 worse to thwart his own Constitutions,
 than the Subjects to trample upon them.
 Nevertheless he not only may, but often
 ought, the Posture of Affairs requiring, to
 make use of Violent Processes for the good
 and profit of those who feel the smart, and
 who wanting his means of Information,
 and an equal Skill in Politicks, cannot be
 suppos'd in any sort to understand the advi-
 seableness of so Rigorous a Course. But
 here his Authority ends, and one Step be-
 yond is a Trespass, a Frustration of the
 End for which he was at all invested with
 his Decisive and Coactive Power; and by
 such a Frustration he shatters all the Fa-
 brick of Government, inverts the just or-
 der

der of Things, and opens a Breach for an Inundation of Mischiefs and Calamities. Is it not therefore permitted Subjects, so soon as they shall be apprehensive of the impending Ruin, to proclaim War against the Author of it? or at least, when it has reach'd 'em, to use their Forces against the common Enemy? Is there not a Principle of Self-Preservation wrought into our very Composition? Does not Nature lay Commands upon us at a Moment's alarm to fight for the good Cause of Flesh and Blood? If Mr. Judge betrays his trust, and wou'd eat up those that apply to him, shall they very tamely Submit themselves, kiss the Paw that seizes 'em, and conspire to take Extremities patiently from him, though never the least Indignity from one another? I confess such an Obsequiousness cannot seem very grateful: 'tis an untoward Lesson to Human Nature, and just no more than practicable. We know indeed a Prospect of Promotion may frequently make us dispense with present Inconveniences and Vassalage. We can readily impose upon our selves the most rigorous Severities and Mortifications, as often as they may probably turn to Account; but to become a meer Property, a Prisoner of War, nay a Sacrifice to the Caprice of one of my own Kind ----- Nature starts at the

Ap-

Apprehension, and must, in spite of its own Oracles, rebel, that is, notwithstanding I at first found it necessary to submit to the Authority, and acquiesce in the Arbitriment of a Third Person, as being the best Expedient both to compose all Differences between my Neighbour and me depending, and to prevent all Encroachments and Provocations against another time; yet our Arbitratour *in my Opinion* dealing very unjustly and inhumanely by me, 'tis time to call in my Obedience, set up for a Judge in my own Cause, (the repugnancy whereof to the dictates of the Law of Nature has oblig'd me as yet to referr my self to a Third Person) and so make my Gentleman understand his Duty by turning his Authority upon himself. Now the Question is, what Consequences flow from such a Practice? Only a plain Dissolution of the Common Establishment, and *Anarchy itself* in perfection; for let the Usurper be Plaintiff or Defendant, his Antagonist has the same right to preside over him, the establish'd Subordination once dissolv'd, as the Usurper over his Fellow-Subject, and the Judge depos'd the least reason of all to Submit to Either. For thus the Case stands. If either Plaintiff or Defendant may have Liberty to pass Judgment upon their Judge in any one Case, he may con-

H frequently

frequently in all Cases, for it lies in his own
 Breast to determin of every particular Case
 whether it be that or no; unless you will
 say with me, that he must suffer himself
 to be finally determin'd concerning that
 Question by a distinct Person, and then that
 distinct Person can no more than himself
 determin whether any particular Case be
 that one, unless he may determine, as Judge,
 of all Cases wherein the Party appealing is
 or may be concern'd; but if in all Cases he
 may judge his Judge, and execute accor-
 dingly (for the Power of Sentencing avails
 nothing, unless attended with a Power of
 Execution, and therefore the former natu-
 rally inferrs the latter) he remains as much
 a Judge over his Judge, as his Judge over
 him; that is, they have an equal Preroga-
 tive in respect of one another, and so being
 in the condition of Plaintiff and Defendant,
 as we have above defin'd 'em, unavoidably
 continue in a State of Anarchy 'till the ac-
 cession of a Third Person to judge between
 them; it having been already demonstra-
 ted that such a Third Relation is essential
 to, and inseparable from the very largest No-
 tion of Government. This then appears to
 be the result of our Argument, that with-
 out Subordination all Parties are equal;
 that Anarchy, as indeed the very Word
 implies, consists in that equality; that in
 this

this Subordination a Superiority of the Inferiour over the Superiour upon any pretence, without inverting the order of Subordination, or in plain English, destroying it, is a most absurd Supposition, and therefore that the Law of Nature admitting of no Absurdities absolutely prohibits the Violation or Interruption of that Order.

I cannot imagine what Exceptions an Adversary shou'd return to this Reasoning; unless he still urges that the Plaintiff, or the Defendant, or both may reserve to themselves in one or more Cases, a Liberty of determining over, or in opposition to their common Arbitratour. But to this our Reply is obvious, and has been already made, that neither of them separately or both together can in any juncture determine for themselves, whether the Case or Cases at that time occurring be those which they have reserv'd to themselves a Liberty of determining, unless they may judge of the State of every Case that occurs, and then they may certainly, if they please, by virtue of that Privilege determin every Case to be such an one as they have reserv'd the determination of to themselves, which is inconsistent with their submitting at all to the Sentence and Decision of a Third Person, seeing his Sentence and Decision shall become invalid as often as they shall de-

termine, that the Decision of any Case by him decided, or to be decided, did not or does not belong to such a Third Person, but was entirely reserv'd to themselves.

Suppose therefore Application be made to a Fourth Person ; suppose we appeal from our present Decider of Controversies to a Fourth disinterested Party ; Alas ! we shall still run our selves a ground, and defeat the very Conditions and Purposes of Nature's Instructions ; for do we not put our selves upon equal Terms with our Judge, thereby rend'ring him Defendant, and our selves Plaintiffs, as often as we dispute his Right of determining for us in such and such Cases, and as often as we betake our selves to the Arbitration of a Fourth Party to determine between our Judge and Us ? And do we not by such a *Levelling*, relapse of necessity into an Anarchical Condition ? Do we not immediately lose a Fundamental Relation of Government ? And after all, is not the Matter finely mended, when (as we have prov'd above) this fourth Person cannot judge of the State of particular Cases, without a Privilege of judging of all Cases ! So that he must either be acknowledg'd our final, ultimate, unquestionable Arbitratour, or in some respects Limited and Accountable. If the first, our Remedy is worse than our disease,

and

and the Constitutions of Nature utterly forbid us to use *for once only* those means of Redress, which necessarily bring us again into the Danger of the Evil we purpose to remove. They cannot dispense *once or twice and no oftener* with our violent Resistances of present Oppression at the Peril of all Government and Civil Security, and by such an Application to a fourth Party as must put it in his Power also to Oppress us for the Future at his pleasure. But if secondly, this Arbitratour's Power shall be Limited to certain Cases and Accountable, still the Subjects must have a Power to determin which those Cases are, and therefore of all Cases, which puts 'em agen upon equal Terms with the Fourth Party, and so excludes that essential Relation of Government *a Judge*, in so much that they may as the Humour takes them, or as one fancy possesses the Plaintiff, another the Defendant, every Moment chop, and change, and challenge, and multiply, and confound their Judges one with another, till the Destruction of all Parties puts an end to the Debate.

But perhaps my Adversaries will still insist upon't, that once, or twice, or thrice upon very extraordinary, threatening, ruinous Emergencies, the Law of Nature may tolerate our violent Opposition, our

equalizing our selves with our Judge, and dissolving that Regulation of Things, upon which the common Security depends. Upon no account certainly ; since either it requires that our first Judge be receiv'd as altogether unaccountable, or in some Cases accountable. If that he shou'd be altogether unaccountable, then 'tis plain we violate that Law when upon pretence of his being in some Cases accountable we betake our selves to a Fourth Person to decide between Him and Us: If that he shou'd be in some Cases accountable, for the very same Reason, the same Law will also require that a Fourth Person shou'd be so to a Fifth, a Fifth to a Sixth, a Sixth to a Seventh, and so on in a Circle to *the World's End*, the Nature of which Regulation compar'd with the Notion of Government above specify'd is no other than *Anarchy*, and the Consequences of it must in truth be so much worse, as an actual Competition and State of War is more fatal than barely that equality and independency of Persons, which affords them Opportunity and Temptation for such a Competition, and such acts of Violence. And I pray, Sir, take notice that if this Reasoning hold, as it evidently does, we are not only oblig'd by it to declare against the Pretensions of an Usurper, as being all, how plausible so-

ever,

ever, outweigh'd by the antecedent Title of the Supreme Magistrate; but moreover, tho there were nothing like such an antecedent Title, to examin, before we acknowledge the Usurper's, whether yielding to a present Exigence he has given up to any other Person or Persons as ample an Authority in some Cases over Him, as he reserves to himself in other Cases over Them, for if he has done so, then Himself and the Person or Persons, whom he has instated in that Authority, are no other than *Plaintiff* and *Defendant* as defin'd above, without a *Judge* superiour to Both by whom they shou'd be determin'd, and consequently in that State of *Anarchy*, which the Law of Nature absolutely forbids all Men, as I have already observ'd, to abet or countenance upon any Terms whatsoever.

Nor do I, Sir, pretend that all manner of Imperfection is foreign to that Establishment, which includes an unaccountable Supreme. I know of nothing on this side Heaven but what has it's Inconveniences. Alas! Government must be lodg'd in the hands of Mortals, every one of whom is little better than Emptiness and Levity in the Abstract; Inferiours perpetually complaining and in mutiny, Superiours often harrassing and oppressing. It must be so 'till Men are either born without disorderly

Inclinations, or may live without Government, or can govern one another without a Subordination of Authoritys. Now where we cannot have Things as we wou'd, 'tis certainly more adviseable to play a bad Game as well as we can; And since we find every Model labours more or less under Difficulties and Disadvantages, what Counsel so fit to be pursu'd as that which the great Monarch of the World has from the Consequences and Posture of Things most evidently and significantly suggested to us? For do not our *Matchiavellians* when they proceed so boldly, some what more than tamper with God Almighty's Prerogative? Where's the Distinction between presuming to defeat his Chastisements, and overruling his Providence? between interrupting his Methods, and prescribing our own? As if Good were likely to come of our Questioning his Mercy, Disciplining his Justice, Instructing his Omniscience, and Daring his Omnipotence.

I hope Sir by this time you can readily relinquish your Paradoxes, and discern the Necessity of a Supreme Power in Political Societies. If not, I shall be glad, when we see one another, to know what Objections you insist upon against any Propositions now recommended to you, along with my very humble Respects, by, Sir, your, &c.

September the 11th 1699.

A N

AN
INTRODUCTION
TO THE
HISTORY
OF THE
Anarchical and Levelling
OPINIONS.

LETTER VI.

Sir,

I N answer to yours of the 17th Instant, I must assure you I should be as well pleas'd as your self to see the Full History of *Sedition* and *Anarchy* made Publick; I mean the chief Instances of them which remain upon Record methodicaly collected, the Measures expos'd by which they were

were effected, and the Characters of the Principal Agents accurately and faithfully delineated. But we must not expect a Work of this Nature should salute our Eye-sight in haste. Pursuant however to my Friend's Desire, and indeed to my own Inclinations, I have set upon fathoming *this Mystery of Iniquity*, trac'd the bitter Torrent up to its Original Sources, and find the Monster to be of *Greek* Extraction. I grant indeed Seditious Practices and Factious Arts were not unknown to the World almost from the time of its Creation. The ancientest Histories both sacred and prophane abound with Accounts of 'em. *Cain's* Murdering of *Abel* was an Act of Treason against *Adam*, and the first we hear of; as *Jupiter's* dethroning his Father *Saturn* stands the earliest Example of this Kind in the History of the Fabulous Age. But what I assert is this, that formal Vindications and Hypotheses of Anarchy never got footing in the World 'till about the days of *Philip* and *Alexander the Macedon*. The Story lies thus.

Plato and *Aristotle* (you must know) being no less, or if you please, more *Courtiers* than *Philosophers*, and flourishing in Disorderly and uncertain Times, when the Commonwealths of *Greece* were either actually distracted and harra's'd by the Tyranny

of

of petty Usurpers, or under imminent Danger from the prevailing Arms of *Philip* and *Alexander*, thought it most adviseable to equivocate so long as Fortune did, and accordingly they so contriv'd their Politicks, that the Liberties of *Greece* might not seem to be prejudic'd by them, and yet at the same time the genuin Notion of Monarchical Government comport pretty tolerably with them. For (as much Poison as some People have extract'd out of these two Philosophers) *Plato* frequently signifies the high Opinion he conceiv'd of a perfect Monarchy: but then he turns it off agen by making it no more than a Matter of pure Speculation. The *Athenians* were a very Captious People, and easily possess'd with Jealousies and Misapprehensions; no wonder then if the Philosophick Statesman us'd Caution, and studiously wav'd what he believ'd might alar'm 'em. Notwithstanding in his *Politicus* he almost ventures to speak out plain, altho, 'tis observable that he makes his *Anonymous* Interlocutour the freest of his Talk upon the Point. Hear a little of the Dialogue. Friend of Socrates, Πίτερον εἰν τὸν πολιτικὸν &c. *What say you then, Sir, will you make one and the same thing of a Civil Magistrate, a King, a Master, and a Father of a Family? Or distribute their Capacities according to their Names? Or how think*

think you of my Deduction? ---- [Socrates Junior] What may that be? [Fr.] Thus it runs. In case a Gentleman, no Physician Profess'd, shou'd be Master of Abilities and Skill sufficient to prescribe to a Doctor of the Faculty, would he not thereby merit a title to the same Appellation that belongs to his Man under Cure? [Junior Socr.] Certainly I think so. [Fr.] Once agen; Suppose an ordinary Subject well qualify'd to Give his Prince Advice upon Emergencies, shall we deny his great Proficiency in Reason and Mystery of State? [Junior Socr.] By no means. [Fr.] I suppose you make no difference between the Art of Government, and the Art of Kings. [Junior Socr.] None at all. [Fr.] Very good; then he who has the Art of Governing in Perfection, let him be a Minister of State, or no more than a Yeoman, may in that respect be stil'd a Prince? [Junior Socr.] No doubt on't. [Fr.] And so Master of a Family and Liege-Sovereign will signify the very same? [Junior Socr.] E'en the very same (as if he had been Sir Robert Filmer) [Fr.] And is it material how large or how narrow Territories we assign? [Junior Socr.] Not that I know of. [Fr.] What must be the Result then of our Argument, but that the Pretensions of all Governours are the same, call them by what name you please, Regal Jurisdiction, or Civil, or Oeconomical? [Junior Socr.] You speak reason.

son. ----- What this Author meant by his
 ἐπισήμη πολιτική, he himself, to cut off all Oc-
 casion of Scruple, has afterwards defin'd,
 τῶ δὲ ἀπασὶν &c. *When I mention Political Arts*
or Exercises, I mean such as affect the Body
Politick, in the establishment of Laws, and
Regulation of Publick Affairs; Whence I
infer that the Passage now translated was
design'd to influence the Reader's Practice.
 Much more may be met with in other
 Parts of his Works to the same Ef-
 fect, especially in his Discourse, περὶ βασιλείας.
 Consonantly hereto says *Aristotle Rhet.*
Lib. 1. Cap. 8. Κυρία μὲν εἰσιν ἡ τρεῖς ἀπόφανσις &c.
The Notion of Government is resolv'd all into
the Sentence and Determination of a Gover-
nour, and may be distinguish'd into sever-
al Forms or Constitutions, being in truth
as manyfold as there are or can be Politics in
the World. These amount to Four, Democra-
cy, Oligarchy, Aristocracy, Monarchy. The
over-ruling or determining Power must be
left to one of these, or to all in consort. (No
doubt in a Subordinate Sense) 'Tis a Demo-
cracy when a certain Number of Magistrates
pass Judgment. An Oligarchy when the man-
agement of Things falls to the Men of largest
Fortune, and best Condition. An Aristocracy,
where Orders and Discipline are observ'd, as
they shall be establish'd and fortify'd by Laws.
For 'tis requir'd in an Aristocracy that the
 Go

Governours have always an Eye 'specially to Laws. Monarchy is twofold; that which is under the Direction of Rules and Ordinances, we call Kingdom; but that which is perfectly arbitrary and absolute, Tyranny, the End whereof he makes the Custody and Protection of the Subject. These Passages carry an Aspect very favourable to Regular and particularly to Monarchical Government. But the Prudent Gentlemen were not so fond of any Maxims they broach'd as to venture the pulling an old House over their Heads by asserting 'em. 'Twas their business so to bring over their Politicks, that like a String in a Pulley they should move this way or that way, as either of Two Contending Parties tugg'd best, tho' Plato behav'd himself the more modestly of the Two, being naturally of a more ingenuous Disposition, and withall less acted by any Motives of present Interest than his Pupil Aristotle, who depending upon the Macedon, a Prince of a fickle, exceptionous, and haughty Temper, and weighing with Himself, how uncertain the Chance of War, how little a piece of Steel might dispatch his Young Deity, and that as upon the Conquerour's Decease his Captains would fall to scrambling for the Power; so the Conquer'd would certainly lay hold on so fair an opportunity of recovering what the Macedon had taken from them; laying
all

all these things together, and unwilling to incur a *Premunire* on either hand, he resolv'd to descant upon the Natural Rights of Sovereign Powers as artificially, as cautiously, and as ambiguously as he could. For if he had chose rather to wave all Notice of the Argument, his Reserv'dness must have created suspicion every way, and as his Patron would have discarded him for holding his Tongue, so the Commonwealths of *Greece* would have been incens'd against him, if he had spoke too plain. Yet we find him upon Occasion, as well as *Pausanias*, mentioning the Novelty of Republican Government in *Greece*, and the Immemorial Antiquity of the Monarchical before it. This was a bold Stroak at that time of Day, and may serve at this to expose the Vanity of a *State of Nature* and *Original Liberty*, for as much as even the *Grecian* Oligarchical and Aristocratical Governments appear'd so late, and then disappear'd so soon. For *Plato's* part, he was often solicited but never perswaded to accept of a Publick Post, apprehending, we may presume, the Defectiveness and Insecurity of the *Athenian* Government, as Things went in his time, both from the Disturbances occasion'd by the *Thirty Tyrants*, and from the growing greatness of *Philip*: and therefore he excus'd himself from time to

to time, by declaring himself incapable of doing any good in an Office, 'till 'twere in his power to reform the Manners of the People, and dispossess them of their common Errors in the matter of Government, &c. a broad Intimation, I take it, in favour of Monarchy; the rather because himself was descended by the Father from *Codrus* the last of the *Athenian* Kings. Royal Blood run in his Veins; which, with Common Sense in his Head, was enough to retain him on the part of Imperial Government. His Deportment, I confess, toward *Dionysius* may bear another Construction, but then 'tis to be remember'd he was none of *Dionysius's* Subject, and so might use the greater Freedom without a Fault. But what was that sawcy Freedom at last? Why he made bold to advise him to change his Government into an Aristocracy, which Counsel he might have offer'd for ten thousand Reasons, beside either any Personal Pique to *Dionysius*, or any Aversion to Monarchical Government, for 'tis acknowledged that *Dionysius* was an Usurper, and held his Dominion in *Sicily* in opposition to the Establish'd Form of Government. Nevertheless I dare not pretend to dissemble or excuse that Blemish which *Euphorion* and *Panatius* have fixt upon the Philosopher (at least according to *Laertius*, whom indeed

deed some of our Criticks, for what reason I know not, have represented as prejudic'd against Plato) πολλὰν ἐς ἐκφυγὴν τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς πολιτείας, how the Exordium of his Politicks was observ'd to have been frequently turn'd and chang'd; so that we cannot fairly purge our Philosopher from *Latitudinarianism*; but it's plain, he detested all thoughts of Anarchy, and all Hypotheses obviously tending to it: much more those immodest, enthusiastical Conceits of the *Stoicks*, who, as became *Fifth-Monarch Pagans*, must by all means constitute every *Wiseacre* among them not a Sovereign only, but a God too, founding thereby both Divinity and Dominion, in Merit. And this Extravagance as well as their *Ill Nature* they deriv'd from their old Instructors the *Cynicks*, for *Zeno* pretended but to refine upon *Crates*, the Third of the *Cynical Triumvirate*, and therefore 'tis by no means so unintelligible how the *Stoicks* cou'd extract Pride, Peevishness, and Faction out of *Cynicism*, as how the *Cynicks* misapply'd and degrav'd the Decencies and Sweetness of the *Socratick Philosophy*, whence *Antisthenes* the Father of the *Cynicks* fetch'd his Documents. But it does not appear that *Antisthenes* brought *Cynicism* to its Perfection of *Scurrility* and *Brutishness*: nay, that Expression of his when he was inform'd

I

that

that *Plato* had been traducing him, 'Tis
the Fate of Kings to be calumniated when they
do well, argues under one a *Facil Temper*,
 and a *Regard to Authority*. No, 'twas a
 Work to which *Diogenes* was design'd,
 the fetching up of the *Rigidness* of his *Sect*
 to an exquisite *Inhumanity*, the starting of
 the *Levelling Principle* among the *Greeks*,
 the making it an *Heroical Exercise of Wit*
 to affront *Princes*, and droll upon the sacred
 Character of *Monarchs*. Where's the won-
 der? His own Father was by Profession a
 Debaucher of true *Sterling*, in plain *En-*
glish, a *Clipper and Coiner*, and that the
 Mystery of *Washing* might not go out of the
 Family, he educated his best Boy in the
 same *Craft*, who when he had laudably
 serv'd out his 'Prentiship, and was banish'd
 his Country for his extraordinary Improve-
 ments, came to *Athens*, and there, I war-
 rant you, commenc'd *Philosopher* for want
 of a better Employ. And a rare *Philoso-*
pher he must necessarily make, that had laid
 so good a Foundation. But what *Tenets*
 and *Maxims* shou'd he stand to? Should he
 take after *Plato*, or any of the more gen-
 teel Masters? Not a Word on't. His grand
 Principle, he's resolv'd, shall be *Singularity*,
 thick larded with an *Hoggish Insolence* and
Moroseness; his *Logick* a *Cudgel of Crab-tree*,
 his *Household-stuff* the bottom of an old

Mustard

Mustard-Pot; his Viands *Carrot-Tops* from the Kennel; his Mansion-House and School an old rotten *Hogshead*, to eat, sleep, and do every thing else in, particularly to growl at Kings and Magistrates out of the *Bung-hole*. His Tryals of Skill this way are many and notorious. I shall only concern my self with Two. One time *Alexander* had a mind to surprize him: *Sirrah*, says he hastily, *don't you know that I am Alexander the Great?* And do not you know, replies the ragged Sophister, with his Arms *a kimbo*, *that I am Diogenes the Cynick?* Another time, observing the Magistrates as they committed a Criminal, *even so*, quoth *Saucebox*, *the great Felons hurry the little ones to Goal*. Perhaps he might look a little blank upon't, when he was cast in the Teeth about his *Coining*, but then he had a slovenly Joke to come off with, *and the time was*, said he, *when I befoul'd my Clouts, but I don't do so now*. A very penitential Confession illustrated by a very cleanly *Simile*! And yet we might dispense with our *Philosopher's* facetious Humour, did he not by fits take Majesty upon himself. But at last forsooth! nothing on this side an Imperial Character and Sovereignty will serve his *High and Mightyness*, and that when he lay under the most Ignominious Circumstances; for when he was now to be sold into Slavery

according to his Deserts, and the Cryer ask'd him, *what he was qualify'd for, and cou'd pretend to? To be a King* (reply'd the Ragga-muffin) *and lord it o'er the World.* In short he took all Occasions to vilify the Authority of Magistrates, and cut 'em down below the common Stature; for why? the old Treasonable Leaven fermented powerfully within him, and he seems to have pitch'd upon an *Universal Equality*, otherwise call'd a *State of Nature*, as the Scope and Crown of all his *Philosophical Efforts*. Let others, thought he, set their Beards in order, keep their Hands and Faces clean, preach up I know not what *Principles*, as they call them, of *Religion* and *Common Civility*; let 'em inculcate the Necessity of a Magistracy to the People, set before their Eyes the Dismal Effects of Untractableness and Rebellion, and prove the Commission of the Magistrate deriv'd from *Jove*; I shall be too hard for 'em. For in the first place I will renounce all Decency and Modesty, and the more swimmingly to convey my self into the Good Graces of the Rabble, I'll go and stand Neck-high in a *Jakes*, denominate my self a *Bull-Dog*, *Mungril*, *Tumbler*, ape the Boys and Girls in the Streets: *V. Diog. Laertium De Vitâ Diog.* If I see them take up Water in their Hands, away goes my Mustard-Pot bottom;

bottom; If a Cobler's Boy sups his Broth out of an old shoe's Toe, away with my skimming Dish too, and by a thousand such pretty practical Jest's will I charm the Souls of the Populace. But to make 'em most passionately fond of me, I'll be very Boist'rous and Salvage, call Names, throw Stones, convince 'em upon Oecasion with an *Argumentum Bacillinum*, talk loud and archly of the *Liberties of the Subject*, admonish Captain Tom of his *Natural Prerogative*, and censure the Measures of Publick Management, Here then lay the Plot of this *Cynical Crabbedness*, that under Colour of Mortification and Disinterestedness in Externals, the *Tatterdemallion Professours* might play their own popular Game with the Rabble, 'till they had ripen'd themselves into *Tylers* and *Cades*, and in the mean Season might have the Diversion of abusing their Governours and all Mankind, but especially their Adorers. Nor cou'd a more secure or a more promising Course have been taken to introduce Anarchy than this of the *Cynicks*, in regard of its Adequacy to the *Genius* of the Vulgar, as also of the Licentiousness which then reign'd among the *Athenians*, and, what I observ'd before, the uncertain Posture of Affairs in most of the *Grecian Common-wealths*.

The *Stoical Politicks* were a Branch of the *Cynical*, tho *Zeno* the Father of the *Stoicks* being a Man of a more generous Behaviour, and Courteous Disposition than his Tutour *Crates*, qualify'd in a great Measure the Malignity of the *Cynical* Discipline, and season'd the sour Composition with something like a Relish of Complacency and *Decorum*; but then he run into an Extream, if possible, more absurd and pestilent, or at least, equally depreciated the Authority of Princes and Magistrates by appropriating it to every Man as he deserv'd, as if he had trod exactly in the Foot-steps of his Master, and asserted Sovereignty to be every Body's natural and necessary Right. Not but the latter *Stoicks* have carried the Point much higher than, I believe, *Zeno* ever intended, among whom *Seneca* seems to have given the Finishing Touches. I know indeed in his first Book *De Clementiâ*, he compliments *Nero* and tells him, *that the Emperour is the very Principle of Union and Continuity in the Body Politick, that it lives by him, that it wou'd in an Instant become both a Burthen to it self, and a Prey to its Enemies, were it to lose its Soul the Emperour, Rege incolumi Mens omnibus una, &c.*

*Inviolable be the Sov'reign's Right,
And then the Subjects will of Course unite,
But if no Prince appear, or more than one,
The State's dissolv'd, confounded, and undone.*

That the Government of Rome is out of all Danger so long as she submits to the Discipline of the Imperial Reins, but that whenever she grows Restiff, breaks the Bridle, or shakes away the Curb, all the mighty Fabrick must drop to pices; and that therefore it is no wonder Monarchs and all Protectours of the Publick by what name or title soever distinguish'd, shou'd over-rule every Private Relation and Interest: for that if Men in their Wits prefer Publick Good to Private, the Sovereign's Person must be superlatively dear to them, inasmuch as the Safety and Subsistence of the Commonwealth is resolv'd into that; and how the Imperial Majesty had ever clasp'd the Concerns of the Commonwealth so close to it self, that to divorce 'em was to destroy 'em, and to sever the Head from the Body. *Ille, i.e. Imperator est vinculum, per quod Resp. cohaeret, &c.* Agen in the same Book, *Natura commenta est Regem, &c.* 'Twas Nature that first founded Monarchical Government, which position he illustrates by her instituting of Monarchy among the Bees. These Flights promise well. But then how basely does he tack

about, and change his note in his second Book *De Beneficiis*? *Eodem loco pone latronem & Piratam, quo Regem animum Latronis ac Pirata habentem.* A Padder, a Pirate, and an Injurious Prince, you may e'en shake 'em in a Bag together. For what must we suppose to be the Consequence, but that they are to be treated all alike, the Terms *Eodem loco* bearing an Indefinite Sense. And thus the Principle of Union, the Soul of the Commonwealth, which ought to be dearer to the Subject than all Private Interests, the very Head upon the Shoulders is rank'd after all with Banditti and Cut-throats, and that very Person into which the Safety and Subsistence of the Commonwealth is resolv'd, becomes Materials for the Common Hangman. But this will by no means content the Stoick, unless he may create himself a King too if he pleases, and teach other People how they may do the like. By what Expedient you will ask? Why truly by Dogmatical Declamations upon the Topick of Natural Equality. *Platonem non accepit Nobilem Philosophia, sed fecit, &c. Epist. 44.* Plato (tho' descended by the Father's side from Codrus, and by the Mother's from Solon) was nothing of a Gentleman, and might not value himself upon his Nobility more than another Body, 'till Philosophy had dignify'd him. Why then, Lucilius, should you despair of ri-
sing

ing to the same pitch of Quality? Alas! 'tis but behaving your self like a Plato, and you're as good a Gentleman. Now in order to your behaving your self like him, it lies upon you fully to persuade your self in the first place, that you are upon the Square for matter of Nobility and Station with every Man in the World besides. And so has been each of our Forefathers thro' all Generations. Then to gild over, and enforce the Argument he misquotes Plato, and very modestly makes him deny in the most opposite Terms the very thing which he asserts; for whereas Plato will have, it, that Kings are descended of Kings, and that the Succession of 'em is to be trac'd up to Jupiter, the Stoick resolves he shall say, that there is no King in the World, but what is descended of Slaves, and no Slave in the World but what is descended from Kings. He goes on. *Omnia ista longa varietas miscuit, &c.* In so long a Tract of time, and Series of Vicissitudes, all Titles and Marks of Distinction have danc'd the Hay at that rate, that now we can only say, Gentle's the Man that does the Gentle Deed. Would you believe, Sir, so judicious a Man as Lipsius had stil'd this Epistle *Pulchra*? But it seems, Stoicism can, as well as equalize all Crimes, render the most Extravagant Positions the most Excellent.

Having discover'd in what Climat Anarchical Principles took their Birth, how they
peep'd

peep'd abroad originally among the *Greeks* thro' the Spight, Singularity, and Peevishness of a Snarling Sophister or Two, how the Stoicks lapp'd up their Spittle, and kept the Levelling Doctrines a foot, tho' by an Hypothesis not the same with that of the *Cynicks*, I presume I have prov'd the Maxims of our *Latitudinarian Politicians* to be of the *Younger House*, for all their Huffing and High-reckoning. Hereafter then let 'em not talk so loud about the Antiquity of their Tenets. We have examin'd the Writings of the Family, and find the earliest of 'em upon Roll Contemporary with *Plato*, and whelp'd in a *Dog-Kennel*. Let the trifling Authour of *Amyntor* begin to recollect whether he might not have found a much greater Advantage in't, if he had laid out that little Chronology he would make a Stir with, not in contracting the *Aera* of the *Sacred Canon*, but tracing the Genealogy of his own *Politicks*. I know indeed the World had spawn'd some Atheistical Professours before the Age I have been speaking of, that consequently dissolv'd all Tyes and Notions of Government; but then we read of no Assertions levell'd by 'em directly against such Notions and Obligations: and beside they were Persons of so rank a Character, that *Civil Polity* receiv'd not half so much Detriment by their Opposition.

on. For a *Loyal Atheist* (if such a *Birth* were possible) would certainly prove more pernicious to the *Commonwealth*, than 'tis possible *Ten Thousand* times as many turbulent *Libertines* should be. How wisely, how graciously therefore has *Providence* order'd Matters in such a manner, that *Atheism* and *Faction* should always go together? that one should be the certain *Symptom* of the other, and so the Scandal of the first obstruct the Influence of the last?

Accept, Sir, my Specimen of that Design which I was projecting to you above, and which I heartily wish some People whom I know to be qualify'd, accommodated, and at leisure for accomplishing such a work, would advance, taking the Hint rightly. Receive, I beseech you, the Respects and Salutations of all Friends here, and particularly of,

Sir,

Your, &c.

May the
29th 1699.

OF
H O N O U R.

LETTER VII.

Sir,

I Thought our Friend Mr. N. had known better Things, than to make a true Principle of *Honour* a meer Matter of Mode, and not a Part of Religion. But I can excuse him the more easily, because 'tis his Misfortune to have spent so much of his time among the *Knight-Errants* and *Bullys* of the Town, whose insignificant, sluggish course of Life so totally disengages 'em from all serious Speculations, that did not Fashions and Forms obtrude themselves upon them, they would be as much to seek even in those Particulars as in all besides. For what would you have the Men do? Make themselves Masters of every Accomplishment? or leave dull, pedantick, slovenly

Greek

Greek, Latin, and Logick, and all that, to your plodding Donns, while they betake themselves to the Noble Sciences of Swearing, Defence, &c. The first, you say, you have untaught your Kinsman, and you may well boast of the Success; The second, I suppose you neither pretend, nor desire to unteach him. The handling his Weapon skilfully does no man a disservice, provided he knows as well how to manage himself. Unless the conduct of the Head goes along with the Conduct of the Arm, an Adversary has more than a double Advantage. But upon the matter of Duelling consult Mr. Collier

To prove a near Affinity between *Honour* and *Religion*, 'tis necessary to do what those Gallants who make such a Bustle about it, never yet thought of; that is, to define the Nature of *Honour*. Is it not surprizing to see a Fellow come reeling and reeking out of the Stews, and belching up his *Honour* as often as he speaks? To hear a Mask in the *Side-Box* form an Affignation, and ratify the Premisses with no less than her *Honour*? To hear the People about the *Exchange* and in *Lombard-Street*; Your *Stock-jobbers, Publicans, and Sophisticatours*, put you in remembrance of their *Honour* at every turn, and be as free of it, as 'twere Nothing but *Brown-paper* and *Shop-thread*?
Not

Not at all surprizing. For the very Ety-
mology of the word *Honour* has been for-
got this many a Day. We will not come
up to the Terms of the Thing, and so we
have brought the meaning of the Word to
our own: Insomuch that for a great Man to
give his Parole, is all one as to say he'll be
Worse than his Word; and Assurances of
Favour imply Disappointments and Re-
pulses. *Credit* and *Reputation* are dwindled
into *Expletives*, and circulate of course like
the Spittle through the *Glands*. 'Tis ad-
viseable to make as tho we were somewhat
concern'd about 'em, because upon Occasi-
on they may serve our Ends; at least they
will suit our Quality, and set off our Breed-
ing. And what if *Cicero* and the whole
Tribe of Grammarians confound *Honour*
with *Honesty* and *Virtue*? Are we bound
forsooth! to follow the Scent of every
strong Imagination? pinion our selves down
to Performance of Articles, because Two
or Three Humoursome Philosophers found
out the Jingle between *Honos* and *Honestum*?
*and is not Virtue in every Climate just what the
People are pleas'd to declare so?* These are the
Soliloquies of the World, and they'll hold
on, I dare promise, to the same tune, 'till
true Notions of Honour be re-establish'd;
and the Grand Impostour cashier'd, which
goes about under that Name. Now all
Pre-

Pretences advanc'd upon any other foot than Religion, are Banter and Romance : Like *Præsto* or *Hocus Pocus*, of use to put off a juggle, and amuse our Senses : but without the Nerves of Religion such Professions cannot have any sort of Consistency. For *true Honour* is a Principle deriv'd from a Consideration of the Dignity of *Human Nature*. So far, I think, we tread sure, and no Body will dissent. The Prerogative of Honour lies within the Compass of Advantages, which distinguish our *Species* from those of Inferiour Beings. A Monkey congees, a Spaniel couches, a Parrot compliments, but for all that, a Monkey or a Spaniel or a Magpie of Honour would sound somewhat harshly. Their Mechanism does not by a long distance come up to the right Standard. Their Qualifications are too inconsiderable, or were they not, they want all Consciousness of them. Accordingly Affectation, or a *Degeneracy of a Man into an Ape*, at once cancels the Nobleness of our Constitution, and takes away the Sense of the Calamity. Our Discriminating Excellences are known to be either rational Powers, or acquir'd Accomplishments; and in the Mismanagement of these either to our own or other People's Prejudice consists *Disingenuity*, Because, First by the abuse we render despicable those Preheminences which God has
made

made peculiar to our Kind. He has put us in a way to discover the true State of Things, and take right Measures; If we take wrong, the Defect is Voluntary and Chosen. 'Tis not Impossible for us to abdicate our Prerogative of Reason: And shall we expect that the Credit and Influence of it should survive our Resignation? Shall we naturalize Our selves in the Family of Irrationals, and afterwards demand the Privileges of a Superiour Condition? But this is not all; For, Secondly we bring a Disgrace upon the Rest of our own Order. He that deals unworthily by me, affects me in more than one Respect or Capacity; He cheapens those general Qualities which it nearly concerns me to see well Apprais'd, over and above all Damages design'd. He brings the Character of my *Species* into Contempt, and wounds mine and all Mankind's Reputation through his own. But to examine the *Crisis* of the Question.

The Eminence of our Nature is confessedly wrapt up in those Rational Powers by which we become capable of discharging our respective Dutys to God and Man. Suppose your self devested of e'r a one of these, and the Painter may draw you from that day forward with a Tail and Talons. Our Faculties are all of a Peice: there's no abusing one without abusing the rest; no
parting

parting with one without giving up all: Our Immortal Part is lodg'd in the Upper Chambers; If it drops out of the Window, there's no stopping either at the first, second; or third Story, but down to the Bottom it must fall. And as our Faculties are Indivisible; So are the Dutys wherein we are to exercise them. Like the *Salts* and *Serum* in the Mass of Blood, they putrify upon *Separation*. And although we should comport our selves never so handsomely toward Mankind in the several Relations we bear to the several Individuals; yet if we do not acquit our selves as gallantly toward our Principal and Sovereign Benefactour, we break through all Sanctions of Honour. Our Blood is attainted, and all the *Heraldry* in the World cannot help our Gentility. For of that Universal Monarch we hold our Liberties, and Charters. Do we refuse the Recognition? The Tenure's Void, and the Benefits of the Grant surcease. Moreover we stand bound to other Articles besides doing Fealty and Homage: Our Fellow-Vassals have a right in Us; They challenge the Offices of Humanity and Generosity at our Hands, and expect a Vicissitude of Assistances and Benefactions. Now what are these but Grand Points of Religion, the Law, the Prophets and the Gospel? so that we must abstract

K

before

before we can distinguish a Principle of *Honour* from a Principle of *Religion*. The Distance is purely *Metaphysical*, and lies entirely not in the Diversity of the Objects, but of the Motives. *Religion* in the strictest sense enforces its Obligations by the Provision of *Future Rewards and Punishments*, whereas the *Congruity of Opinions or Practices to our Nature* is the proper Motive and Occasion of *Honour*. 'Twas this the *Stoicks* mistook for *Wisdom*, not considering that *Wisdom* comprehends under it not only a Principle of *Honour*, but all Principles of Religion and Virtue whatsoever: They imagin'd a *Part* to be the *Whole*, and ascrib'd as much Force to one Impulse as to many. Nothing but a right Valuation of the Dignity of our own Nature, were all Prospects of Future Happiness or Misery to be taken out of the Scale, could incline us to Judge and Act suitably to that Dignity. I do not say this of itself would suffice to sway us; but on whomsoever it prevail'd in its Degree, it would denominate that Person a Man of *Honour* and *Ingenuity*. The grosser Interests of Life so vehemently outbias the Inducements of meer *Rational Harmony*, that even the certainty of a Future State withall does not ever make the latter a *Match* for the former. What an Heroical Greatness of Soul is it then to court

naked

naked Truth and Virtue, and love 'em *passionately* for their own Intrinsic Worth? to wave the pursuit of Sensual Satisfactions and Vulgar Advantages, rather than disobey the Dictates of Right Reason, or aim short of an absolute Integrity or Generosity? When we have reach'd this Height (which, by the way, we can never do without Special Assistances from above) we are then arriv'd beyond the ordinary Influence of *Corruption* and *Debauchery*; We may insist upon our Honour and Reputation, and reasonably presume that our Asseverations shall be taken as equivalent to *Signing* and *Sealing*. O what glorious Advances a Man has made when his Character thus blazons it self! when his Example cheers the World, and he passes in it for a *Fund*, as it were, of *Honesty* and *Bravery*!

The *Dutys* of Honour are either *Speculative*, *Passive*, or *Practical*; The *Speculative* conversant about the Business of *Truth* or *Evidence*: The *Practical* extend to the *Exercise of Virtue*: The *Passive* lie between both, and turn upon *Reasonableness* of *Principle*, and an *Actual Acquiescence*. As to the *Speculative*, We ought always to proportion our Assent to the Circumstances of *Credibility*, which are various, in regard of the Authority of the Party Instructing, or of the matter of Instruction. For Instance; If we turn to our Ideas of Cause and Effect,

we must acknowledge the Certainty of God's Existence; and when we have spent some Contemplations upon the Nature of his Attributes, we shall be convinc'd that he can neither mistake nor falsify. Hence we urge on our Conclusions, and assure our selves that whatever he has prescrib'd or declar'd, either by express Revelations, or Tacit Intimations of Nature, must be true and obliging. When we have trac'd Consequences thus low, and look'd into the necessity of their *Coherence*, the Laws of *Honour* as well as Understanding require our Assent to be *forth-coming*: So that whatever some Fops conceive, *Atheism* and *Infidelity* cannot take hold of any but *abject, sordid* and *ungentlemanlike* Spirits. To descend to *Human Authority*, 'tis reasonable Narrations in general from Man to Man should pass Current, unless where Notoreity of Fact, Inconsistency of Circumstances, or the Foulness of the Relater's Character creates Matter of Exception; or when Concerns of the last Consequence depend upon the Truth or Falshood of such Narratives. In points of Speculation and Judgment, 'tis no Affront to take the Liberty of trying Propositions by my own *Touch-Stone*. Nay, he that demands an Implicit Assent from me, pronounces me a Fool in Comparison of himself, and that's a breach of Articles;

Not

Not to mention how unfair a Dealer he deserves to be deem'd, who would extract Credibility out of Defect of Evidence. But when Matters of Fact are offer'd us to be believ'd, we ought to shew Our selves as good-natur'd as we can, and if we have not Faith enough to take 'em for granted, endeavour to fancy 'em true rather than betray our Suspicions. I confess when a Man makes a Custom on't, and Romances *by the Day*, 'tis time to mortify him. We receiv'd our Hearing for more comfortable and more profitable Purposes. 'Twere a Crime to let our Understandings lie fallow meerly for the convenience of *Sportsmen*. Besides there's an untoward Imputation in such Usage, for it argues as if our *Paschalls* concluded these Entertainments were most suitable to our Capacities. 'Twas therefore luckily manag'd by a certain Old *Duke*, who when one of his Neighbours had worn out his Patience with Tales and Tattle, call'd in his *Fool*, and desir'd his Guest *either to draw on Red and Yellow upon his own Shoulders, or upon his Grace's; whether he pleas'd.*

The *Practical Duties of Honour* are *Justice, Gratitude, Generosity, Industry, and an Active Courage.*

Whatever Blessings Providence has entitl'd us to, it has conferr'd upon us in considera-

tion of the Dignity of our Nature. How scandalously then do we misbehave ourselves, when we alter those Assignments of God which he has made to every Man, in regard to Human Perfections? How strange an Ignorance of our selves do we betray by such Counsels? How manifestly forego the Privileges of our Kind for a Brutal Parity? Inasmuch as it is not the bare use of Associating that distinguishes a Society of Men from a Pack of Beagles. They hunt, we see, in a Body, while each Curr makes sure of the Whole Game for himself; and yet as much as they are in a State of Nature, whenever they Open they utterly confute Mr. *Hobbs*, and prove beyond all Possibility of Contradiction, that a *Multitude of Animals may trace the same Scent, Cheek by Jowle, without tearing out one another's Throats*. But Human Societies subsist upon Order, Distinction, and Property. The Common Stock must first be parcel'd out, and when that's done, to play the Mighty Hunter, or the Little Pilferer is to abjure all the Excellences of our Being, and a Transmigration into *Isgrim* or *Reynard*. Nay more, we must make no allowance for Indirect or Sinister Methods of any Kind. The most minute Niceties of Equity must be observ'd. If our Descriptions and Characters of Persons vary in the
smallest

smallest Circumstance from the Truth of Things, the common Right's infring'd. There's a Party damag'd, and a *Compensation* due from the *Misrepresenter*. As for *Gratitude* and *Generosity*, I look upon 'em as the *Limbs* of *Justice*. My Benefactour is my Creditor, (whether he will or not) only with this Difference, that the Obligation remains even after Compensation has been made. So again, if my Friend, or my Friend's Friend, or my Countrey's Friend, or any Member whatsoever of the great Society of Human-Kind stands in need of Encouragement or Support, I owe it him, provided my proper Occasions are by the Proportion of such a Sum less Urgent than his. When we pretend a Title to our Superfluities, we strangely mistake our selves: They are Perquisites arising to the Publick, and altho the Right of Donation rests in the Possessor's Hands, yet is he no more licens'd to with-hold or misapply them, than a *Guardian* the *Redundances* of his *Minor's* Fortune. For if we would view Things impartially, 'twere easy to perceive that formal Conditions of Indentures are not the only Instruments of Equitable Obligations: No, every Opportunity of doing a Courtesy which God dispenses, brings with it all the Virtue of Bonds, Engagements, Acts and Deeds. As for Example; Has

such a Great Man, my profess'd Adversary, fallen into Contempt and Extream Indigence? And does it come in my way to be serviceable to Him? There's no excusing my self, unless I seize the *Advantage*, and strain all my Power and Interest on his behalf. Prove the Event as it will; If my Behaviour kindles in my Enemy a Sense of Gratitude, that Sense will soon grow to Ardour of Affection, and I shall make a Double Friend out of a Single Foe, beside the Glory of the Action: If he will not be wrought upon, I have reveng'd my self abundantly by taking so generous a Method to make him expose his own Unworthiness, and enhaunce his Benefactor's Reputation. I disarm him by so noble a Carriage, and cut off all Possibility of a *Retreat*. Further; a right Principle of Generosity excludes all Arts of Equivocation and Cavilling, all Subterfuges and Ambiguity of Meanings. These are a lamentable Reproach to Human Reason: They imply a *Drunkenness* of the *Understanding*; as if our Apprehensions *saw double*. And the Mischief on't is, the Inconvenience comes home to us at last; We shall banter others 'till it becomes natural to circumvent our own Judgments, as the Philosopher argu'd so vehemently against the Reality of Colours, that i'th' upshot he fancy'd it *snow'd Black Wool*.

Industry may seem a Word of too rude an Importance to signify a *Duty of Honour*. 'Tis for Dependants and Mechanicks to take Pains; a Gentleman's Business lies in consulting his own Ease and Pleasure, keeping a good House, making his Friends welcome, and once in his Life serving as Sheriff, or so, for the County. But with Submission, I allow no Personage whatsoever to stand above the Duty of Industry, by which I mean a Daily, Constant Application of himself to such Studies and Exercises as may be Useful to his Countrey and Friends. Every Man's *Genius* or Condition sets him his Task. Advantages of Birth and Fortune are his Instruments to compals it, and the greater Variety of *Tools* lies in the Shop, the more and the better Manufacture we may expect from the Hands of the *Workman*. Certainly the Means of doing Good in our Generation will afford us no very plausible Apology for the Neglect of it. Our Intellectual and Bodily Abilities suffice for the Discharge of more Functions than that of *Mutual Ministration*. There's work cut out for 'em abroad, and the Greater Lords we are at Home, the more of Service and Attendance we owe the Publick. When Heaven has put into our Hands its *Earnest of Pay*, we are *prest* to double Duty, and oblig'd not only to keep our Estates Entire, not only to make good

good the Talent, but employ it to Advantage; not only to keep our Bodys Plump, our Understandings Clear, and our Memories Sound, but so to manage the Gratification of our Senses, that we still have Understanding and Memory enough at hand, to meditate for the publick Weal, and Fortunes ample enough to administer to its Occasions. For we still prove but very bad Nurses to our Dear Selves, if by pampering Flesh and Blood we starve the Rational Part, or *vice versa*. Now nothing starves that Part so much as *Inactivity*. Idleness and Oscitancy are a sort of *Atrophy* of the Soul. In a Word, the Man that lays his Intellectuals up in Laverder, his Abundance in Coffers, and his Carcass in Down, declares it his Opinion, that the grand Privileges of Human Nature are all *Bawbles* and *Kicksbams*.

To gain Ground a little, and come forward with our Documents, 'twill not serve our Turn, if we keep our Minds in Use. Honour teaches an harsher Lesson yet; It bids us take the first Alarm, and run all Risques in justifiable *Causes*. What? Shall my Country be invaded, or my Friend assaulted, and I stand by unconcern'd? Is my Blood so diluted with Cowardize, that the Noise of a Drum, or the Sight of a Sword turns it all to Ice? Or have I not Soul enough left to warm the Mass of *Why*? Shall

Shall a blind stupid Alacrity carry Men of Plebeian Spirits up to the Mouths of the *Ordinance*? and shall I that am fortify'd with a Sense of the Justness of the Occasion, and of the Nobleness of True Valour, faint or flinch? Shall every *Snap-sack Urchin* dare to storm a *Granadeer's Whiskers*, pant in Pursuit of Danger, and enjoy his Wounds; and cannot Religion, Philosophy, the Liberal Sciences, and all the Forces of a Genteel Education reconcile Action, Hazard, and Smart to me? For shame, along, Man, Charge briskly, and let thy Eyes flash a Greatness of Soul in the Face of the Foe. Such a *Prowess* like the *Cannon* of the *Spaniards* firing upon the *Mexicans*, will make your Enemy take you for a *God*; he throws down his Arms at the Apprehension, and acknowledges your Person to be *Sacred* and *Invulnerable*.

Passive Fortitude is own Sister to the *Active*. The last exerts it self *in the Field*; The first when we are beleaguer'd; When our Principles must hold out a Siege; and the Fury of Devils, Usurpers, and Tyrants is let loose upon us. This is the most Signal Test and Instance of *Honour*: for there must be no *Capitulating*, no Yielding to Terms, no other choice than either to raise the Siege, or take no Quarter. But first and foremost it lies upon us to see we go upon good Grounds.

If

If our Principles at last should not be Defensible, the Credit of our Constancy to 'em is all resolv'd into Imputations or Palliations: and we denominate our selves either *Hardy Knaves*, or *Well-meaning Fools*. Upon all accounts therefore let the Case be first fairly stated, and the Reasonableness and Importance of Opinions well prov'd; and then we may grow proud of the Occasion, appeal and apply to Heaven, secure a good Conscience, and the Malice of Men and Fiends will be lost upon us. A Breast *garrison'd* with Resolutions of Integrity is, at last, the only *Impregnable Fort*. *Iustum & tenacem propositi virum*, &c.

*A Soul resolv'd to keep at any rate
Its Moral Majesty Inviolate,
How shall Popular Madness? How
The Sentence of a Sylla's Brow?
How Tempests battling o'er the Biscay Bay,
Or the fork'd Ensigns from high Heav'n
dismay?
To Chaos let the Universe return;
He drops Compos'd into the Mighty Urn.*

If Honour be really grounded upon the Dignity of our Nature, how illustrious a Height of it, I say, should we seem to have reach'd, when we thus transcend and chastise our Constitution, rather than we'll quit
our

our Pretensions to it? When we have got the Knack of disappointing Difficulties and Terrours? When we are habituated to rise upon the Tide as it flows in, and have made the business of Suffering perfectly familiar to us? Then the Solemnity of a Triumph commences within; The Lustre of our Worth shines round our Temples, and our Eluded Oppressours do Pennance in the bitterness of the Defeat. Our behaviour creates wonder in the Witnesses of it, even against the ruling Influence of Interest and Prejudice, makes the most forward Compliers grow out of Love with Themselves, and all Mankind detest the Authors of our Afflictions.

To reduce what I have observ'd to the Purpose in Hand; I suppose him very little vers'd in his Bible, who does not discern that these Duties of Honour are properly *Theological* Duties. Justice, Courage, Liberality, Gratitude, Sedulity stand in the sacred Volume eminently recommended, exemplify'd, and enjoin'd. And the more effectually to engage us, the Divine Excellency has condescended to exhibit it self as our Pattern, and encourag'd us to enterprize a most humble Imitation, by assurances of Sufficient Succours and Eternal Rewards. These are such Concurrent Inducements as render the Beauties of Honour

nour and Virtue ten thousand times more Conspicuous than otherwise they would appear. When a Mistress proves an Heiress, her Charms mend upon't strangely; and Certainty of Success withall, One would think were enough to excite the most Phlegmatick Constitutions. But when DIVINITY it self has assum'd our Nature, and in it gone thro a Course of perfect Goodness and absolute Virtue, to make 'em the more Venerable; What an abject Image of a Man, What a Blemish to Human Kind must he be, that undervalues and defies them? And how wretched an Absurdity should we think it to be perpetually Chirping to the Tune of *Honour* and *Reputation*, unless we can plead the Merits of a *Religious Conversation*, and that we hold our Patent of *Christ* and his *Apostles*?

This Notion of *Honour*, as it is the truest, so 'tis the most Comprehensive, and reaches down to the very meanest Conditions. A Beggar may make his best of the Principle thus understood, as well as an Emperour; with this Distinction still, that Obligations of Honour arise in Proportion to the Advantages of Birth, Education, Power, Fortune, &c. The Reason is evident: for in general, the right Application of These imports the Dutys of Justice, Gratitude, Generosity, Liberality, Valour, Constancy;

flancy; so that the larger our share of 'em, the more Scope we have to exercise those Duties, and consequently the more Enforcements. Upon this account 'tis highly reasonable to respect especially the Character, and depend upon the Faith of Persons of Note and Quality, with whom as the ordinary Temptations to Disingenuous Practices are supposed to be less; so on t'other hand the Terrour of the Disgrace to be more prevalent than with their Inferiours. Notwithstanding it appears, that the Baits of Ambition are prodigiously Magnetical among the *Great Ones*. A Prospect of Dominion easily intoxicates 'em, and no Tyes of Consanguinity, Affinity, Solemn Asseverations, Promises, Oaths can sometimes restrain 'em. One would swear they lay under a Fatality of acting basely, they proceed with so little Concern, and such an Indefatigable Assiduity.

These, good Sir, are my Sentiments about *Honour*. Your Acquaintance may think 'em Singular and Rigid. I cannot help it. I promise my self that you, Sir, for your part, will judge more favourably. Others, perhaps, of a Volatile, Ceremonious Temper had rather rest satisfy'd with Superficial Pretences, than go to the trouble

(144)

trouble of laying new Foundations : But
you are already prepar'd with a *Basis* of
Religion, and accordingly, I conceive,
cannot but admit of the Premisses from,

Sir,

Your &c,

May the
5th 1700.

O F

OF THE
S O U L.

LETTER VIII.

Sir,

I N Obedience to your Commands I have drawn up that Demonstration which I lately promis'd, of the Immateriality and Immortality of the Soul deducible from Natural and purely Philosophical Principles, and believe I have express'd my Meaning much more clearly, fully, and methodically, than with my best Endeavours I cou'd possibly do in any Familiar and Uncorrect Passages of ordinary Conversation. It's my Opinion, I must own, that Metaphysical Questions ought never to be Topicks of Common Discourse, for when they are made such, the Argument, be sure, spoils Company, but the Company spoils the Argument much more. So that 'till the Pro-

L secution

secution of a Metaphysical Dispute becomes Matter of Duty (as it frequently may upon points of *Religion*) 'tis very impolitick and almost unmannerly to set abstracting Notions, and forming Solutions and Distinctions. But not to cost you more time than I needs must, and to draw directly toward the principal Business, I must remark to You in the first place, that of all the vast variety of Subjects which has exercis'd the Wit of Penetrating and Learned Men, that of the Nature and Properties of the Rational Soul has, considering it's Dignity and Import, been the most superficially handled. I know very well 'tis a daily Topick of Discourse with our Philosophers (for I am not here concern'd with it to a Theological Purpose) but e'er they can come to a decisive Proposition, either they misunderstand one another, and that before they think on't, or else they lose sight of their Argument, and slide into Matters impertinent and foreign, as 'twere by common Consent, from which disappointments they draw these Inferences ; That the Nature of the *Soul* is inscrutable, and ought not to be made a matter of Controversy ; That there's no certain means of finding out its Immateriality or Materiality ; nor yet by any Principles and Efforts of natural Reason, its Immortality or Mortality ; That

we are left utterly in the dark with relation to Spirits, as well as ignorant of the Virtues and Powers of Matter, and that Revelation, and Revelation only, affords us an assurance of the Immortality of our Souls, as well as of the Resurrection of our Bodies; nay, so rigid are some as to pronounce it detrimental to the meekness of Faith to search after any other Methods of Certainty in so obscure a Concern, and look upon the Enquirer as one of the Apostle's Babes that *has need of Milk, and not of strong Meat.*

Now is it not somewhat strange that when Disputants find themselves gone off from the Argument, or before they have taken due care to explain themselves fully and clearly to one another, they should rather conclude the Question to be undeterminable, than that they have taken a wrong course to determin it? 'Tis their own Confession; and matter of Fact, that they cannot tell whether they're mistaken on this part, or on that; Which way then came they to know that the Soul's Immateriality cannot be prov'd by purely rational Deductions, any more than that it can? But they lay down their Arms upon equal Terms, and because neither Side comes off victorious, jointly proclaim it Impossible for any Body else to succeed better in the same Field.

“ O! ’tis a Question miserably involv’d;
 “ my Friend here and I have been laying
 “ out our Thoughts and our Lungs upon
 “ it these Five Hours, and the longer we
 “ argue, the more we are confounded; when
 perhaps if a Term or two between ’em
 were a little better explain’d, or a forgot-
 ten Proposition retriev’d, the Rays of Truth
 wou’d dart in upon them from behind the
 Cloud, and the whole Mystery unlock it-
 self to their *fumbling Apprehensions*.

For although, ’tis true, we are not in-
 timately acquainted with the Nature of Spi-
 rits, yet so much, as I presume to shew,
 we understand of them as to learn whether
 that which operates so and so, is a Spirit
 or not, and whether that which is a Spirit
 is Immortal or not; and for my own part,
 I must confess I think my self less a Stran-
 ger to the Nature of my Soul, than to that
 of my Body, or of any external Object af-
 fecting my Senses. This, I shall be told, is
 all Arrogance and Paradox. But I ask
 why? Are not my Sensitive Perfections more
 remote and various than the simple Opera-
 tions of my Soul? And must not every Ob-
 ject of Sense first move all interposing Matter,
 as particularly every Object of Sight so far
 as it is such, or however must it not move
 one Part of the Nerve, the Nerve the Brain,
 the Brain the Soul, before it makes any di-
 stinct

distinct Impression upon us? Whereas the Operations of the Soul are present and immediate, and we cannot but be conscious both of its Actings, and the manner of its Actings. We do not indeed see, or handle, or smell its Substance, neither do we in a strict Sense, see, feel, or smell the Substance of *Sensible* Objects; for the Impressions we receive from them, are *Evidences*, not *Communications* of their Substances to our Organs, and without *penetration of Parts* can be no other. Yet the Soul has in it self both Evidences of its own Existence, and Characters of its own Essence as clear and distinct as it receives of the Existence and Essence of *Sensible* Objects: For Instance, I find that this Substance, which I now hold in my hand, exists, and that the Substance existing is a Ball of Matter by certain Impressions made upon my Sensories: and I am yet more *emphatically* convinc'd that a certain Substance within me *thinks*, and that it is at least a distinct Substance in it self, whose proper *Actings* and *Influences* differ widely from those of the Objects of my *Senses*.

But why, I wonder, must our Faith languish under the Disquisition? are we, I I wou'd gladly know, the less resign'd in our Wills and Understandings, because we endeavour to prove that That which God has

certify'd us of by Revelation, is agreeable to the Principles and Notices of sound Reason? 'Till we have sufficiently examin'd what Information our Natural Faculties afford us, we know not but they may also resolve us to our satisfaction upon the Question, which if they can, 'tis our Duty to make use of that Advantage (which God Almighty has provided, and certainly no crime to illustrate what *Revelation* asserts by demonstrations of *Reason*. For why must our *Faith* grow weaker, because our *Judgment* corroborates it? why must we trust the less in God, the more Motives we have to believe what he declares, and to expect what he promises? Nor is the danger great, if after we have been teizing our Faculties, we come to no Conclusion, the belief we entertain of the Truth and Certainty of God's Revelations remaining still entire, and upon as good a Bottom as ever. And although it may be alledg'd that our Faith is the more Excellent, the less of rational Probability the Matter of it is attended with; yet we were not to be excus'd, should we decline or neglect those rational Measures which it lies in our Power to take, of further ascertaining, or at least, adorning the Matter. Perhaps I may be anticipated, and have it suggested to me, that God having by Revelation discover'd the Soul's Immortality

talities, it's not necessary he should make it also discoverable by deductions of Reason. But no Body can have any great Opinion of this Inference, who recollects that God has both in the Old and New Testament asserted his Existence and Attributes, notwithstanding that of necessity *whosoever comes to God, must antecedently believe that he is, and that he is a Rewarder of all such as diligently seek him.*

To repeat the several Arguments offer'd by the Ancients, especially by some of the *Socratics*, the *Platonists*, and *Stoicks*; and to remove the Objections advanc'd heretofore by others, particularly by the *Epicureans*, were alike unnecessary in this place; the rather, because I design a more finish'd and more copious Discourse upon this Subject. The best we can say of both is, that the former were for the most part as unsecure and intricate, as the latter trivial and absurd. The Ingenious *Des Cartes* has among the Moderns alone appear'd as a *Demonstrator* of the Soul's *Immateriality*, but with such ill success, that our *Scepticks* are not only fortify'd in their Doubts and Disbelief, but our Philosophers utterly discourag'd from pursuing any longer their Enquiries. His mistakes were not a few, but the Foundation of them all we may reckon his Supposing that Matter was adorn'd with no o-

ther Powers and Properties than what were known to him, whereas if he had argu'd *negatively*, confes'd himself somewhat more a Stranger to the Virtues and Force of Matter, and only attempted to prove, that whatever and how various soever they might be, the Faculties of the Rational Soul must be foreign to Matter (which I hope very easily to prove) it had been hardly possible for him to miss the Demonstration, whereof the great Man was not without reason so very ambitious. We cannot, 'tis certain, comprehend all the Effects which the many possible Modifications and Schematisms of Matter may afford, but notwithstanding we may by a due Search convince our selves that this or that particular Operation is above its Capacity, and consequently that whatever thus operates is not Matter.

And here I begin my Demonstration, designing it shall consist of two Parts; in the First I propose to evince the Soul's Immateriality, in the Second its Immortality.

To proceed regularly, I will first lay down some Definitions and Postulates, which I must desire my Friend to carry along with him in his Memory.

My Definitions are of a Material and an Immaterial Substance,

By

By a *Material Substance*, I understand a *Substance extended, or having Three Dimensions, Length, Breadth, and Depth.*

By an *Immaterial Substance*, a *Substance not extended, or not having Three Dimensions, Length, Breadth, and Depth.*

My *Postulates* are,

1st. That an Omnipotent, All-good, All-wise God exists.

2^{ly}. That at least *Material Substances*, and particularly some belonging to our own Persons *actually exist.*

3^{ly}. That no *Material Substance* can want one of these *Three Dimensions, Length, Breadth, and Thickness.*

These Definitions and Postulates premis'd, we must in the next place observe that there can be no *Medium* between an *Immaterial* and *Material Substance* as defin'd above, that is, no such Individual Substance can exist, as shall be a *Mixture* of *Materiality* and *Immateriality*, seeing whatever in such a *Mixture* has *Three Dimensions* must in its Nature have a distinct Being from whatever has not *Three Dimensions*; else that which has *Three Dimensions*, and that which has not *three Dimensions*, might be the very same *Being*. If therefore that Substance which has *Three Dimensions*

Dimensions is incapable of those Operations which are proper to the Rational Soul of Man, the Rational Soul of Man is not such a Substance.

Not the Power of drawing Inferences from Premisses, not the Power of comparing Ideas or Conceptions one with another; no, nor so much as the Power of Observing or contemplating any single Idea is comprehended in my Notion of a *Substance having Three Dimensions*, the bare *Substantiality* of that Substance having not a Force to draw Inferences, or compare or observe Ideas, nor yet its *Three Dimensions in Conjunction with it*. Let us entertain the Idea of a *Substance having Three Dimensions*, as long as we please, (provided we do not at all enlarge it) we shall never find that any of the Three Operations of the Rational Soul above-mention'd is included therein.

If therefore those Operations are the Acts of a Substance having Three Dimensions, it must be because of some other Powers or Properties inherent in, and depending upon the *Substance with its Three Dimensions*.

A *Substance having Three Dimensions* is the *Foundation* of all other Powers or Properties, which inhere in, and depend upon a *Substance having Three Dimensions*.

Now

Now the Force of such essential Properties and Powers, and whatever how many soever they are, cannot exceed the force of that Substance, and those Three Dimensions, which are their Foundation.

For Instance, *Mobility* in such a Substance is a Power or Property inherent in, and depending upon a *Substance having Three Dimensions*, and the Force of that *Mobility* is proportion'd to the Force of the *Mobile*, because tho the *Mobility* may be *abstracted in our Conception* from the *Mobile*, yet if we will consider it, as it stands in its own Nature related to its Subject, it must be resolv'd into the *Mobile*.

In like manner the Force of *Figure* in *Matter* is proportion'd to the *Substance Figur'd*, because tho *Figure* may be abstracted in our Conception from the Thing Figur'd, yet if we consider it in its Relation to its Subject, it must be resolv'd into the *Thing Figur'd*.

But if the Powers and Properties founded in and dependent upon the Three Dimensions of an extended Substance can have no more *Operative Force* than their *Foundation*; and if their *Foundation*, viz. a *Substance having Three Dimensions* has in it self no such operative Force (as we have prov'd before) it follows, that whatever has such an operative Force, must be a Being independent of

of a *Substance having Three Dimensions*, or, in other Words, no Power or Property, or Conjunction of Powers or Properties founded and inherent in a *Substance having Three Dimensions*, but a Being distinct from it, and a *Compleat Being*, because a Being Un-compleat is not capable of Operations; which *Compleat Being* distinct in its own Nature, and independent of a *Substance having Three Dimensions*, or the Powers or Properties founded in such a Substance, is therefore that Being which contemplates and compares Ideas, and draws Inferences, an *Immaterial Substance*, a *Substance having not Three Dimensions, Length, Breadth and Depth*.

Agē; a *Material Substance* is either at rest, or in Motion, there being no *medium* between *Rest* and *Motion*; for so soon as ever *Rest* ceases, *Motion* commences.

A *Material Substance* perpetually at rest operates not; a *Substance having Three Dimensions* in a State of *absolute Inactivity* is without Perception.

The Motion of a *Material Substance* is either of the *Parts* of a *Mass* of *Matter* among themselves, or against one another, or of one *Part* of *Matter* against or toward another at *Rest*, or toward an *Imaginary Point*.

The Motion or Passage of one *Individual Part* of *Matter* toward, or to an *Imaginary Point*

Point is not any one of the Three Operations of the Rational Soul mention'd above, being no more than a *Succession of Situations*.

The Motion of a Particle of Matter to or against another at Rest, is not any one of the Three Operations of the Rational Soul above-mention'd, the Motion of this Particle being the same with that of the former, only continu'd so far, that the Surface of the moving Particle touches the Surface of the resting one, which *Touching* in Conjunction with the Motion antecedent to it is not any one of the Three Operations of the Rational Soul above-mentioned.

The Motion of the Parts of a Mass of Matter among themselves, or against one another, is not any one of the Three Operations of the Rational Soul above specify'd, the Motion of each Part being the same with that one Individual Part of Matter toward or to an Imaginary Point, 'till the Parts *encountering* touch, which *Touching* in Conjunction with the Motion of each Particle antecedent to their *Touching*, is not any one of the Three operations of the Rational Soul above-mention'd.

And if Matter at Rest cannot beget any one of those Three Operations, and is with all incapable of any other Operations, than the Motion and Contact whereof we have been

been speaking, and which cannot be any one of the Three Operations of the Rational Soul, then cannot that which so operates be *Matter either at Rest or in Motion.*

Observe, that *Acts of Memory* are couch'd under the Operation which I call *Contemplating of Ideas*, every Act of Memory properly so call'd being a Proposition attended with a *Certainty in Relation to Things Past*, equivalent to the Certainty or Verisimilitude either of a Proposition *Self-evident* or *Probable*; as also that *Acts of the Will* are resolv'd into *Propositions*, for he that determines, *I will do so* or *so*, determines himself by a Proposition either *tacit* or *express'd*, which Proposition comes under the *Operation of comparing Ideas.*

Having now prov'd the Rational Soul of Man to be an Immaterial Compleat Being or Substance, I shall advance to prove, that *every Immaterial Substance is in its own nature immortal, and only dissoluble by an immediate Act of the Creatour.*

The Dissolubility or Mortality of an Immaterial Substance, if it be Subject to any, from a *Finite Being*, must result either from some Principles or Qualities in it self, or from the Force and Influence of a Material Substance existing distinctly from it, or from the Force and Influence of some other *finite* Immaterial Substance or Substances.

Nothing is more evident than that an Immaterial Substance is not, in its own nature, lyable to Mortality or Dissolution. For what is Dissolution, but the *Separation of the Parts of a Continuum or Body?* and what is Mortality but an *Aptitude and Tendency in an animated Body to such a Dissolution?* and how can there be any such *Aptitude and Tendency*, or any such actual Separation of the Parts of a Continuum or Body, where no such Continuum or Body is to be found? and how can an *Immaterial Substance* be such a *Continuum or Body?*

That all *Dissolution* is such a Separation is most evident; for so long as the Parts of a Body either animated or inanimate continue in that same Posture or *Crafsis*, in which they are best preserv'd, and which only can be alter'd by *Separation*, Dissolution cannot be effected.

And because all *Dissolution* is resolv'd into such a *Separation*, therefore agen an immaterial Substance cannot be mortal or Subject to any Dissolution, which it might receive from the Force and Influence of a Substance or Substances *Material*, no such Separation being practicable 'till, at least, that which separates has reach'd the *Surface* of the *Continuum*; whereas an *Immaterial Substance* (as I have already evinc'd) cannot have *Three Dimensions*, and Consequently not a *Surface*.

Nor

Nor is it in the Power of one Finite Immaterial Substance to dissolve or destroy another: seeing neither that Immaterial Substance which should destroy, nor the Immaterial Substance to be destroy'd can have a *Surface*, without which on the Part of the Dissolver there can be no Impression made, or Influence convey'd, as the Substance to be dissolv'd is not susceptible of any Impression or Influence, and yet without such an Impression or Influence there can be no *Dissolution*, if, as we have prov'd, *Dissolution* be nothing else than the *Separation of the Parts of a Continuum*.

But how then comes it about at last, that we perceive our Souls to be almost perpetually, and often very sensibly affected by our Bodies? How come they so wonderfully to sympathize unless ally'd in Nature and Qualities? Whence can proceed that remarkable Inequality which we daily meet with between the Rational Faculties of Men? Which way become Human Souls obnoxious to the Sollicitations of Spirits good or bad? How shall the departed Souls of the Righteous conceive hereafter any Satisfaction from their Commerce with blessed Spirits? and how shall the Devils be the Ministers of God's eternal Vengeance on the Souls of the Damn'd?

I answer, we may be assured in general, that both Bodies and Spirits can affect Humane Souls. Of this we must be convinc'd by the Divine Oracles, and our own constant Experience; nay, and we know not by what means our Souls can be thus affected. But still this in no wise weakens the Evidence of the Demonstration we have been now laying down. A Material Substance or another Immaterial Substance may be the cause of Pleasure or Pain to an Immaterial Substance, and yet not the cause of Dissolution or Destruction to it. By what methods a Material or another Immaterial Substance should beget Pleasure or Pain in an Immaterial Substance is to me unknown: That neither of them can dissolve or destroy it, I have before demonstrated. I am ignorant of the manner of Communication between a Body and a Spirit, and between Spirit and Spirit, and not only so, but perhaps of many Properties and Powers belonging to both; and therefore I cannot in many cases determine whether a Spirit or a Body can effect This Thing or That, but yet I know of and can find out many Things which neither a Body nor a Spirit are capable of Compassing, and particularly that a Body or another finite Spirit cannot dissolve or destroy a Spirit, so that we may fairly conclude

M

clude as the Admirable *Verulam* has done somewhere in his Book *de Augm. Scient. Si quis judicio infirmior existimet, istas Corporis in Animam Impressiones, aut Immortalitatem Animæ in dubium revocare, aut Imperio Animæ in Corpus derogare; levi Dubitationi leve Responsum suffecerit. Exempla petat, vel ab Infante in Utero Matris: qui simul cum Matris Affectibus compatitur, & tamen è corpore matris suo tempore excluditur: vel a Monarchis, qui licet potentes, à servorum impetu quandoq; flectuntur, salva interim Majestate sua Regia.*

In a Swoon, 'tis true, a Man is not conscious of any Operations of his Soul, nor when he's fast asleep; but I am persuaded that our Souls are in action and at Work all the time we lie fast asleep, or in a Swoon: for altho the Avenues of Sense are so clos'd that it's not excited by external Objects, yet it may be taken up with more abstracted and pure Speculations, and we upon reviving or 'waking lose all remembrance or consciousness of such Operations of our Souls, because no sooner are the Organs of Sense unlock'd, but the Impressions (to speak Metaphorically) of sensible Objects return upon our Souls with such violence, as to cancel the remembrance of Operations accompanying the Swoon or Sound Sleep, and absolutely engage the Faculties in the Contemplation

of

of those sensible Objects. Thus our Pulse beats and our Lungs play while we sleep, and yet we cannot remember that during that space of Time we perceiv'd our Pulse to beat, or our Lungs to play.

Or because in this State of Probation the Union of Soul and Body is so order'd, that the Body and its Appetites concur with the Soul toward the compleating the Moral Actions of the Man, (and therefore whatever we say and do in our sleep is no other-wise Meritorious or Culpable than as when awake we have occasion'd, or shall approve it) we may believe the Soul, by God's appointment, has her Intermissions of acting, while the Body is not in a Condition to cooperate, but the *Immaterial Substance* of the Soul remains still undissolv'd, its Forbearing to act not at all inferring its ceasing to be. But when the Body incapacitated by Death can no more exercise those Functions whereby it concurs with the Soul in Moral Actions, 'tis no longer necessary that its Action should be interrupted, because the Body, on Account of which its Intervals of Rest were assign'd it, can maintain no further Commerce with it.

Now if an *Immaterial Substance* is not lyable to Dissolution, it must exist 'till annihilated by the First Cause that created it, and that he will never annihilate it I presume to prove.

First, From his having created it such a Substance, as neither a *Material*, nor another *Immaterial Substance* can dissolve or destroy.

'Tis most suitable to the Infinite Goodness of God to continue the Existence of his Creatures so long as his other Attributes of Wisdom, Power, &c. admit of such a Continuation. All *Immaterial Substances*, as we have prov'd above, he has created so as that none but himself can destroy them; whereas a Finite *Immaterial Substance* may destroy and dissipate a *Material Substance*, or one *Material Substance* dissipate another, (every day produces Instances in the several Parts of the visible World) and by such a Dissipation those Properties, that Variety of Texture, Frame, and Order of Parts, on the score of which the Kinds and Species of *Material Substances* come to be distinguish'd from one another, are vary'd and vanish, while for as much as Texture, Frame and Order of Parts are foreign to the Nature and Notion of an *Immaterial Substance*, as also Dissolubility from the Force of any other *Immaterial Substance*, it's evident the Creatour, who by this Means has made it impossible, that an *Immaterial Substance* should perish otherwise than by Annihilation, all acts whereof are proper to himself alone, will in his Infinite Goodness con-

tinue

tinue ever dispos'd to perpetuate the Being
 of *Immaterial Substances*, such a perpetuation
 being no way inconsistent with his Attribute
 of *Omnipotence*, nor with that of his *Justice*, nor
 with that of his *Wisdom*; not with his *Om-*
nipotence, because such a Perpetuation is in-
 deed a very Remarkable Act of it; nor with
 his Infinite *Justice*, because he has by no
 Covenant oblig'd himself not to perpetuate
 the Existence of *Immaterial Substances*, it be-
 ing unconceivable, that a God of Infinite
 Goodness in a State of absolute Liberty
 and Independency, should enter of choice
 into Covenant with any Part of his Crea-
 tures, either to their Prejudice and Disad-
 vantage, or to the Prejudice and Disadvan-
 tage of any of their Fellow Creatures; nor
 yet with his *Infinite Wisdom*; because the
 End of that Immunity which every Imma-
 terial Substance enjoys from all destructive
 Force in another Immaterial Substance, or
 in Material Substances, must respect imme-
 diately God himself; for if the End of eve-
 ry material Substance's Existence is distinct
 from the end of the Existence of Matter,
 they must respect the Creatour *immediately*,
 and therefore the Creatour Existing to all
 Eternity, the End of the Existence of Im-
 material Substances must remain to all E-
 ternity, and consequently Immaterial Sub-
 stances, so long as their first chief and *prox-*

imate End exists, must, according to the Wisdom of the Creatour, exist too, that is, to all Eternity.

It will be objected that God is the End of all his Creatures, and that if, as the preceding Argument concludes, they must exist so long as the End of them exists, Material Substances as well as Immaterial must exist to all Eternity.

I answer, that the Creatour is the proximate and indeed only End of Immaterial Substances, his Attributes being their proper Objects of Contemplation, but God is remotely and mediately the End of the Existence of Material Substances, having made them Occasions to the Rational Soul of contemplating and glorifying the Attributes of their Common Creatour, as also *Instruments* and *Provisions* for the Exigences and Uses of his Rational Creatures, and that therefore when they can no longer serve those Ends, a Period shall be put to their Existence. Thus God, who has made Man after his own Image, an Intelligent Immaterial Substance, as to the Principal Part of him, has devis'd to his Use and Benefit the Material World, and given him *Dominion over the Fish of the Sea, &c.*

2ly. The Creatour has not only conferr'd upon Immaterial Substances the Faculty of Intuition, but of comparing Ideas and drawing
ing

ing Conclusions, and so capacitated them, at least in some measure, to distinguish Truths from Falshoods, Moral Good from Evil. To these Faculties he has annex'd a Power of choosing or refusing, and because the well or ill exercising and regulating these Faculties renders Rational Creatures worthy of Rewards or Punishments, and Rewards and Punishments are not, as 'tis not to be suppos'd they should be, distributed in proportion to the Demerits of such rational Creatures, during the State of their *Probation* in this World, 'tis most agreeable to the Justice and Goodness of God to begin his Dispensations of Rewards and Punishments, not before, but so soon as the Season of Probation is past.

Now here two Scruples arise, Whether the Rewards and Punishments which God dispenses in this Life are not proportion'd to the Demerits of the Parties ; and if they are not, whether it be necessary that the Existence of the Soul should be perpetuated to *Eternity* in consideration of those Rewards and Punishments.

That the Divine Retributions are, to all outward appearance, partially and unequally ordered in this World, no man of ordinary Converse and Remark can choose but observe: the boldest Miscreants often triumph, and the Life of the best Men is ge-

nerally one continu'd Scene of Sorrow and Misery. Hence 'tis obvious to infer that God's Justice will certainly hereafter *balance the Accounts*, and both make up for the Calamities which Good Men have undergone, with glorious Comforts and Pleasures in another State, and conclude the Pomp and Pride and Prosperity of ill Men, with the Saddest Punishments and severest Expressions of his Vengeance. Nor must it be presum'd that altho' to outward appearance Rewards and Punishments are here unequitably distributed, yet many of those Persons who seem to be singularly Good Men, have privately and to themselves some time or other been guilty of Crimes to which all their Calamities are due, because many others, who visibly and notoriously persist in the practise of the most enormous Villanies frequently enjoy an uninterrupted Tranquillity, and meet with as good Successes as the best Men might promise themselves in consideration of their own Innocence. You'll say, perhaps, the Terrours of their Consciences, and Expectations, or at least Suspensions and Apprehensions of Future Punishment sufficiently im-bitter all the present Satisfactions of Wicked Men, and pass into a Torment proportion'd to the heinousness of their Outrages: but it must be granted that they are either

con-

conscious to themselves of some grounds why they should entertain Suspensions of the Possibility of Future Punishments, or not. If they are, that Consciousness must arise from a Sense of a Disproportion between the Evil they have wrought, and the Evil they have suffer'd, and that Sense clear and convictive, as prevailing upon their Judgments in spite of strong Prejudices, in spite of the heartiest Wishes that it were not *clear* and *convictive* ; and therefore those ill Persons by witnessing a Disproportion betwixt the Evil they have done, and the Evil they have suffer'd, prove future Retributions to be necessary : but if they are not Conscious to themselves of any such Grounds, then cannot any Apprehensions of Future Punishment and Terrours consequent thereupon disturb them, for it's not only an easy Thing to rid one's self of such Apprehensions, but impossible for Ill Men to have 'em, unless they saw some Reason for their Suspensions ; and although, 'tis true, upon Supposition Ill Men can trifle and conquer all Apprehensions of Punishments to ensue, the prospect of those innumerable Casualties and Dangers, to which their Lives are each Minute unavoidably expos'd, may beget in them very melancholy Reflexions, mortify 'em in the height of their Enjoyments, and create such a Sollicitude and Anxiety as we
may

may suppose a Punishment proportionable to the Guilt ; yet the Prospect of those Casualties (provided no Apprehensions of Punishment beyond this Life affect them, as we now put the Case that they do not) can create no more Sollicitude in the Worst of Men than it could, by it self, if they were never so Pious and Virtuous, and therefore cannot exclusively of other Apprehensions, to Ill Men, as such, become a Punishment bearing any Proportion to their Guilt. Indeed they might reasonably expect that God Almighty should much sooner afflict and cut them off, than if they did their Duty, but when by constant Observation they found those Persons whom they ever look'd upon to be Pious and Virtuous met with those Ill Accidents as often and as soon (nay oftener and sooner) as the Profligate and Lewd, they wou'd most easily master their Fears, and presume themselves as safe, tho' they pursu'd their Ill Practices as if they had never enter'd upon them, if not safer : provided, I say, we exclude all Apprehensions of Punishments to come.

And I further argue, that if God has constituted the Immaterial part of us the Seat of Moral Good and Evil: if he has made it capable of comparing Ideas and deducing Consequences in order to distinguish Truth from Falshood, his Purpose therein must
be,

be, that the Rational Soul should make use of that Capacity; it being inconsistent with Infinite Wisdom to bestow a Capacity of Reasoning, and withal not to propose, that the Substance whereon it was bestow'd should not make its best use of that Capacity; and if God has propos'd that the Immaterial Part of Us should make its best use of that Capacity, leaving it in our Power whether we will *choose* to make use of it or not, he has oblig'd us, as we would approve of and serve those Ends which he has propos'd in bestowing upon us the Capacity aforesaid, to make the best use of that Capacity; and if he has oblig'd us, or in other Words made it our Duty, he has made the Obligations of that Law effectual by assigning Rewards and Punishments so as to make the Obligation of the Law effectual, he has afforded us some Occasion to expect these Rewards and Punishments hereafter, or none; if no occasion, then the end of assigning those Rewards and Punishments, and consequently of making an Obligatory Law cannot be answer'd in those Persons who being conscious to themselves of the foulest Enormities, yet thrive and prosper and live in Pleasure, while they oppress and ruine Men of the most innocent Conversation and greatest Merit, because by sure Experience they are taught that the Worst
Men

Men here fare as well as, nay better than, the best ; but if they have an Occasion offered them of expecting Rewards and Punishments hereafter, then God, who has afforded them such Grounds, and cannot in any measure *deceive*, reserves as certainly for his Rational Creatures the Rewards and Punishments of a future State, as he has given them cause to expect such Rewards and Punishments.

Besides, every Violation of that Law of Reason, to the Observation whereof God has oblig'd his Rational Creatures, cannot be *personally* satisfy'd for by perpetual Punishments inflicted on each of us that has so violated that Law. The most perfect and entire Obedience were no more than that which we naturally owe to the Legislatour, and therefore the least Infringment makes it impossible for us to satisfy the Divine Justice, unless by an *Eternity* of Punishment, because Justice cannot be satisfy'd till Reparation be made, and no Creature can make Reparation of an Injury to its Creatour, because the means of making such Reparation must be wholly *from the Creatour*. It appears then that Divine Justice requires every Transgressor of the Law of Reason should be consign'd over to eternal Punishment, and consequently that his Rational Part, being the Seat and Source of

his

his Moral Practises must exist eternally. But because the Mercy and Goodness of God are Infinite as well as his Justice, no Body can avoid concluding, that the Creatour in his Infinite Wisdom has fram'd a Method, whereby he may make his Rational Creatures eternally Happy instead of consigning 'em to eternal Infelicity, and yet have his Attribute of Justice satisfy'd ; *eternally happy*, I say, for as his Justice on one hand, without such a Remedy calls for an Eternity of Punishment to satisfy it, so on t'other his Mercy, such an Expedient for Remission once found, is prepar'd to instate the Persons, to whom the Benefit of that Expedient reaches in an Eternity of Bliss answering and *confronting*, as it were, that Eternity of Torment which his Justice inflicts, such an instating of the Persons who become entitled to the Benefit of the Expedient, no less suiting the Notion of God's Infinite Justice than his Requiring eternal Satisfaction from the Violatours of that Law which he has promulg'd to the Conscience, is agreeable to the Notion of his Infinite Wisdom. Thus *Human Reason* easily and naturally leads us into Contemplations and Enquiries with Relation to such an Expedient, till at last she brings us within sight of the *Christian Oeconomy*, and then *Divine Grace* receives her Pupils. Infinite Justice

is not to be satisfy'd, as we have prov'd above, but by an Eternity of Torments. And therefore the *Rational Part* of every Transgressour must be reserv'd to an Eternity of Punishments, if no Expedient be found to get him releas'd. Infinite Mercy promotes, to the utmost, the Interest and Happiness of *Rational Creatures*. Infinite *Wisdom* provides the best Methods of promoting their Interest and Happiness. Nor is it to be suppos'd that God foreseeing by virtue of his Omniscience that those *Immaterial Rational Substances* would certainly contract that Guilt by which they should be involv'd in eternal Misery, would have created such *Immaterial Rational Substances*, unless withall he foresaw that he both cou'd and shou'd provide such an Expedient. Thus, I say, naked Reason furnishes out an assurance of the Soul's Immortality, and evinces the Necessity of God's having provided some proper and admirable Expedient for that purpose; and thus with all we are thrown upon the Belief of Divine Revelation and Christian Religion surprizingly, and even before we thought on't.

By this time I hope I have demonstrated upon *Natural Principles* both the Souls Immateriality and Immortality, after which it would be a tedious and unnecessary task to weigh all the Objections and different Opinions

nions which Philosophers of former or latter Ages have broach'd. The *Epicurean* Atoms, the *Stoical* Fire, the *Peripatetical* *Entelechia*, the *Pythagorean* *Harmony* are notions either so very unconceivable, or so preposterous when conceiv'd, that after those Arguments we have insisted upon to another effect, I shall wave the Examination of their Probability; I should say, *Possibility*; seeing whatever the two former can alledge in defence of their Doctrines is answer'd by those Proofs which I have brought of an utter Incapacity in a Material Substance to Think or Reason; and whatever the Third meant by his hard *Name*, and the Fourth by his *Metaphor*, an Immaterial *Being* only, and that *Being* a *Substance* is able to meditate and infer. Yet it may not be unseasonable to examine the Strength of some Objections laid down by our Ingenious Countreyman Mr. Lock in his *Reply to the Answer to his Second Letter*. Not that I here take upon me to censure or interpose in the Management of that Controversie any otherwise than as my present Topick relates thereto. He teaches us Pag. 400. that to say *we cannot conceive how Matter without superadded Perfections, can produce such effects, is in truth no more than to say, Matter in general, or every part of Matter, as Matter, has them not; but is no reason to*
prove,

prove, that God, if he pleases, cannot superadd them to some parts of Matter, unless it can be prov'd to be a Contradiction, that God should give to some Parts of Matter, Qualities and Perfections which Matter in general has not. Now had this Ingenious Gentleman reflected a little upon the former of these Lines of his, he must have observ'd that they make directly against the Doctrine which he meant to enforce by them, for here he seems to grant that it may be prov'd a Contradiction that Matter, as Matter, should produce such an Effect as Reasoning or Thinking, although by virtue of superadded Perfections it may produce such Effects: Now I cannot imagine what himself understands, or would have us understand by *Matter*, but *Matter as such*, and by *Superadded Perfections*, but Perfections not included in the Idea of Matter, as *Matter* properly signifies a *Substance having Three Dimensions*, or as in a larger Sense it may signify a *Substance having Three Dimensions and withal Divisibility, Figuraibility, Mobility*, in a word the several Properties which have a manifest and Immediate Dependence upon its Three Dimensions. To understand by *Matter* any Thing but *Matter*, is to understand by *Matter* something more or less than *Matter*, or in other words, to confound and perplex Ideas, a fault against which

which Mr. *Lock* has especially caution'd us, and therefore whatever Perfections we may conceive superadded to Matter, must be in their own Nature distinct from Matter, as Matter; because Matter, as Matter, *i. e.* a Substance having Three Dimensions, and by consequence those Properties which immediately and evidently depend upon its Three Dimensions, is a Compleat and Entire Thing, and the Idea of it a compleat and entire Idea; so that whatever Perfections are superadded to it must be *essentially* distinct from it, and capable of subsisting, though such a Substance were remov'd; otherwise such Perfections would be of the Essence and yet not of the Essence of that Substance. And if these Perfections are essentially and in their own Nature distinct from that Substance, then is their Subsistence distinct from it too, whereof Mr. *Lock* himself seems to be sensible (Pag. 397.) where he observes that *whatever Excellency, not contain'd in its Essence be superadded to Matter, it does not destroy the Essence of Matter if it leaves it an extended solid Substance, or wherever that is there is the Essence of Matter.* Most certainly; and must not therefore every such additional Excellency as is not included in that Essence of Matter be look'd upon as essentially distinct from Matter? unless Mr. *Lock* will make an *Accessory* Excellency

N

lency and an *Essential* one to be the same. Whatever *Excellencies, Properties, or Powers* are not founded in the *Three Dimensions* of a Material Substance are *out of and foreign* to a Solid extended Substance. 'Tis true, other excellent *Qualities* as lodg'd in a *distinct Subject proper to them* (for all *Qualities, Intellectual* as well as other, its evident, require a *Subject of Inhesion*) may by *Composition* be very intimately united to a solid extended Substance. To insist upon the *Inexplicableness of the Revolutions of the Planets* (as Mr. L. does pag. 398.) or the *Excellencies and Operations remarkable in that Part of Matter, whereof consists the vegetable part of the Creation*, (Pag. 399.) or the yet greater *Perfections and Properties occurring in the Animal World, and no ways* (as he supposes) *explicable by the Essence of Matter in general* (*Ibid.*) avails nothing to Mr. Lock's purpose; For as inexplicable as the Revolution of the Planets may be, the *Motion or Mobility* of them consider'd as an *Affection* inherent in a Subject, Immediately and necessarily depends upon the *Three Dimensions* of its Subject and certain we are of its so depending; as also the *Excellencies and Operations* in the *Vegetable Part of the Creation* are notoriously such as may be accounted for by the variety of those *Properties*, and the manifold *Combinations and Modifications* of them which

which *immediately* depend upon the Three Dimensions of their Subject; in as much as if we admit of a due multiplicity of Figure, Motion, Situation, &c. in the minute insensible Parts of Matter, we shall find that Multiplicity might be a sufficient means under the Conduct of the first Cause, for the producing of those Effects which we call *Vegetation*. Nay, the yet greater Perfections and Properties occurring in the Animal World, I think, are very explicable by the Essence and General Properties of Matter: Not indeed in the way of those mistaken *Cartesians*, who misunderstanding their own Master (as it might be prov'd upon 'em at large, were the Question fit here to be discuss'd) pronounce Brutes to be a kind of gross unweildy Machines, *coarse Clock-Work*, with Springs and Wheels and Pullies in their Paunches and Sculls: but so long as there are no Instances of their *acting rationally* but such as I think are easily solvable by the Powers of the most subtil Particles of Matter acted upon, if not sensibly by the immediate Force of the Impellent, yet insensibly by Communication through a proper *Medium*, I know not why in accounting for the Perfections which we meet with in the Animal World, we should have recourse to any other Principles than those of Matter and Motion,

the Operations of which Principles are involuntary and necessary, and so all the Actions of a meer Animal, tho' indeed *analogous* to those of a *Free Rational Agent*. In a Word, every *Rational Agent* is conscious to himself of his own *Rationality* and *Freedom*, and needs no better Conviction in that Regard than what he receives from his own perpetual Experience : But he has not the same Evidence of any Brute's acting at all Rationally and Freely, nor yet an Evidence equivalent, because it cannot be plainly prov'd that the Actions of Brutes are voluntary and flow from Election. 'Tis confess'd they have a very near Resemblance to voluntary Actions ; but yet 'tis at least so probable as that the contrary cannot be prov'd, that they are necessary Motions effected and directed by the same *Regimen* of Providence as any necessary Motions observable in the Oeconomy of the Vegetable World, or of any other Necessary Movers in the Universe. But whether or no either the *Vegetative* Soul in Plants, or the *Sensitive* in Animals be Material or Immaterial, this is certain, that if they are Material, they are constituted of a Substance or Substances having Three Dimensions, and that they have no other Excellencies or Properties than what depend immediately upon those Dimensions,

mensions; if immaterial, their Excellencies
 are not properly superadded to Matter, but
essentially distinct from it, and no otherwise
 annexed to it, than as their Subject may be
 united to them by the most intimate Union
 of Composition. Of the *Manner* of this Uni-
 on I grant I have no Notion, being unable
 (as Mr. Lock suggests, p. 401.) *to conceive*
how Matter should affect an Immaterial Being,
or be mov'd by it, but notwithstanding I
 may, nay must perceive the Necessity of
 such an Union, because without such an
 Union Matter could not affect, nor an Im-
 material Substance be affected, or *vice versa*,
 unless Matter and an Immaterial Substance
 might be *essentially one*, of the Impossibility
 whereof I am convinc'd by an *Antecedent*
Demonstration, namely first that which I
 have fetch'd from the Consideration of the
 Nature of Matter, or an extended Sub-
 stance, and agreeably to which the Inge-
 nious Mr. Lock himself acknowledges (p.
 409.) *that Matter has not NATURALLY in*
it a Faculty of Thinking, but that certain par-
cels of Matter, order'd by the Divine Power,
as seems fit to him, may be capable of receiving
from his Omnipotency the Faculty of Thinking;
not Naturally, (observe it) *not as Matter, not*
as an extended solid Figur'd Substance (for
 that's his *Idea* of a *Body*, p. 396.) but the
Superinducement of some Excellences not

contain'd in the Nature of an extended, solid Substance, that is, of some Excellences distinct in their Nature from an extended solid Substance. 'Tis not to be disputed but *that God can join Things together by Connexions inconceivable to us*, (p. 405.) but to confound the Essences of Things essentially distinct, to make an extended solid Substance and additional Excellences, or Excellences not immediately depending upon or founded in the Three Dimensions of an extended solid Substance to be one and the same Being implies that very Contradiction which himself acknowledges to lye out of the *Cognizance* of Omnipotency, *viz. to make a Substance to be solid, and not solid at the same time*, (p. 405.) *solid*, in as much as it has Three Dimensions; *not solid*, in as much as it has *Excellences* proper to an unextended Substance, and foreign to the Three Dimensions of any extended Substance, or to any Properties founded in or resulting from those Three Dimensions, upon Supposition (as I have prov'd above) all Properties known or unknown founded in those Three Dimensions, can be no more sufficient for begetting the Operations of the Rational Soul than the *Three Dimensions only in Conjunction with their Subject*.

Nor has my acute Adversary only confess'd an extended solid Substance and the Additional Excellences or Faculties of Thinking

Thinking, &c. to be in their own Nature distinct, but *secondly*, he has *undesignedly* prov'd as much. For thus he Expostulates with his Adversary, (p. 413.) *You will not deny, but God can give it, (viz. a Substance suppos'd to have been solid at first, afterwards render'd Immaterial) Solidity, and make it material again, For I conclude it will not be deny'd, that God can make it again what it was before. Now I crave leave to ask your Lordship, why God having given to this Substance the Faculty of Thinking, after Solidity was taken from it, cannot restore to it Solidity again, without taking away the Faculty of Thinking.* Is not this clear arguing for the Distinction I assert between an extended Substance and the Thinking Part of a Man? For unless Mr. L. means the Faculty of Thinking has no dependance upon a *solid* Substance, how comes he to suppose such a Thing as a Substance endued with the Faculty of Thinking *after* Solidity was taken from it? For if from a Substance Solidity be taken away, and yet the Faculty of Thinking may still remain, 'tis evident that Faculty of Thinking exists in its Nature separate from Solidity, and *out of* those Three Dimensions which concur to the making up of a solid extended Substance. Perhaps it may be alledg'd that Mr. L. here proceeds upon his Adversary's Supposition,

not upon his own. And I grant indeed he denies Omnipotency can so change a Body into an Immaterial Substance, as that the solid Substance and all belonging to it, should not be annihilated, (*pag. 412.*) but then immediately after he allows (unless I mistake him) that a Substance may be suppos'd depriv'd by Omnipotency of that Solidity wherewith it was once endu'd, and then endued with a Faculty of Thinking, and afterwards endu'd also with that Solidity which it had formerly lost. And if, Sir, you will be pleas'd to look over the 412th. and 413th. Pages of Mr. L's. last Letter I dare say you will construe his meaning as I do.

By this time, Sir, I take it for granted, you begin to repent, you ever put the Question to me, Whether I thought the Immateriality and Immortality of the Soul demonstrable from Natural Principles. I am persuaded you cannot disrelish Truth, and I hope I have urg'd nothing besides ; but my free Unscholastical Manner of Arguing may not perhaps yield so rigid a Logician the Satisfaction which 'tis wish'd he might receive from any Notions imparted by his Faithful Friend and Humble Servant,

&c.

March the
23d. 1699.
700.

Two

Two or Three

Obvious Considerations

Evidencing the

Truth and Divine Authority

OF THE

Sacred Records.

LETTER IX.

Sir,

I Am over-joy'd to understand by yours of the 18th that my most Worthy Friend's *Letter against the Deists*, wrought such an Effectual Conversion, and so easily, in those Gentlemen you had given over for lost; altho, I confess, I cannot wonder at it, when I recollect with what a Force of Demonstration, Perspicuity of Stile, and Comprehensiveness of Argument, that Admirable

Essay

Essay is penn'd, as every thing else of the same Author's, who seems in this Age of Apostacy and Enthusiasm, extraordinarily commission'd, as it were, for converting anew the revolted World, and scattering the rally'd Forces of *Gentilism* and *Primitivo Heresy*. Many Men can lay Consequences very handsomely together, and bring their Adversaries to a *Non-plus*; but then they are forc'd to leave 'em *Adversaries* at last, and dismiss the Evil Spirit *unexorcis'd*, tho' *silenc'd*: while in him the *Innocence* and *Amiability* of the Dove are so exquisitely temper'd with the *Wisdom* of the *Serpent*, that Ignorance and Impertinence have not Power to provoke him, Artifice to disappoint him, Obstinacy to withstand him. But waving his Praises which alone can put him out of Humour, I shall endeavour, as You command, in an humble Imitation of him to prove, that the Consideration of the Divine Attributes demonstrates of course the Authority of the Christian Religion to be uncontestably Certain and Sacred, or, in other Words, that upon supposition God is a most perfect Being, which that he is I have elsewhere demonstrated, the Historical Evidence we have of the Matters of Fact contained in the Holy Scriptures is equivalent to the clearest Mathematical Demonstration.

If

If in the Nature of the Deity all Possible Perfection be concluded, it is not to be disputed but that he is All-knowing, All-wise, All-good, &c. and as All-knowing, he cannot be impos'd upon. First, because there is nothing which is or can be an Object of Knowledge, but, whether Past, Present, or Future, must absolutely and entirely come under his Intuition, in as much as if any single Object of Knowledge lay out of his Ken, his Power or Attribute of Knowledge would not be so ample as 'tis possible for it to be, and so in some Sense and Measure defective. Secondly, Because all Operations of every Intelligent Being besides, wholly depend upon, and are directed by the Author of Intelligent Beings, as all the Motions and Influences of Unintelligent and Material Beings are order'd and over-rul'd by the same Power, to proper Ends and Purposes; and all Deceit is utterly impossible, where the Party to be deceiv'd cannot but be privy to all the Councils and Conceptions of the Party suppos'd to deceive.

As *All-wise*, and *All-good*, God will not be any way the *Author* or *Occasion* of another's being deceiv'd.

As All-wise he cannot, 1. because Deceit implies *Error*, as Error implies a Disagreement, greater or less, of our Notions
or

or Conceptions with the true and real State of those Matters to which we affix our Conceptions; now if God cou'd in any sense be the Author or Occasion of such a Disagreement, then Two Ideas repugnant to one another might, possibly, be in him: the Idea of the true and real State of those Matters to which we apply our Conceptions, and the Idea which is the Archetype of our Conceptions, disagreeing with the True State of Matters. And altho' God be the Author of all our Conceptions so far as they are Acts of the Soul, yet he is not at all the Author of that *Disagreement* in any of them, but that *Disagreement* wholly arises from a *Deficiency*, which *Deficiency* is imputable to the *Concipient* only.

2. Because an *All-wise* Being cannot direct its Dispensations to Ends interfering with one another, whereas the End which it proposes in really ordering Things so and so, and the End which it wou'd propose in causing a *Concipient* to suppose them order'd, or to be ordered otherwise, must interfere; for the first End answers to a *positive Decree* or *Determination* in God, the second to an *Idea* in God, by which he wou'd disown that *Determination* to the Party to whom he suggested a false *Idea*, which *Act* of *Renunciation* is evidently inconsistent with the Nature of a Decree eternal

ternal and immutable, such as all Decrees respecting the real and fix'd Ends of Things must be.

As *All-good*, God will not be any way the *Author* or *Occasion* of Deceit or Error.

1. Because a Being Infinitely Good or Benevolent cannot, as such, be the Author of a meer Negative; and all Deceit, as we have observ'd already, is no more than a Negative.

2. Because those Ends, for which he vouchsaf'd to make us Rational Creatures, must in part be frustrated by Error; for all Error being contradictory to Truth, the Pursuit whereof is most evidently the End of our having the Means to pursue it, the End of all Error must be contradictory to the End for which we were made Rational Creatures, and consequently frustrate it so far as any Error obtains.

3. Because whatever is eternal must necessarily be immutable, and all God's Attributes must be eternal, and if all, then his Attribute of *Goodness* and *Beneficence*, which yet it cou'd not be, if God having made us capable of perceiving and acquiring Truth, at least in some Instances, should yet in other Instances occasion our falling into Error, seeing it would follow, that God is the Author of Truth and the Author of Error, and that therefore his Attributes are not only

ly Mutable, but even Incompatible with one another.

God therefore as a Being All-knowing, All-wise, All-good, &c. can neither be impos'd upon himself, nor the *Author* or *Occasion* of *Deceit* and *Error* to his *Creatures*.

These Considerations premis'd, we are next to examin whether God has establish'd any *Criterion* by which we may determin as *certainly* and *securely* of the Truth of *Matter of Fact*, as of *Mathematical Problems*.

Matter of Fact, as it properly and really is such, is either *Past* or *Present*, for the *Future* is not yet *Matter of Fact*, tho it be never so certain that it will come to be so.

The *Criterion* of the Truth of *Matter of Fact Present* we have prov'd to be the Testimony of our Senses, as that Testimony stands confirm'd by Reason. See *Philosoph. Essays. Essay 5th.*

The *Criterion* of *Matter of Fact Past* cannot be immediately the Testimony of our Senses, so that the *Criterion* by which I must judge of the Truth of *Matter of Fact Past*, must be a *properly Rational One*, unless God has constituted no certain and unquestionable *Criterion* at all.

Whether God has ordain'd any One, or more *Criteria*, by which we may as certainly and securely, as if we had *Mathematical Demonstration*, determin of the Truth
of

of *Past Matter of Fact in General*, I shall not now enquire: But that he has ordain'd a *Criterion* by which we may as certainly and securely determine of the Truth of *Past Matter of Fact*, relating any way to that *Moral Good or Evil, Truth or Falshood*, which he has made us capable of acting or discerning, I presume to prove,

Because whatever relates to such *Moral Good or Evil, Truth or Falshood*, most nearly concerns those, who being qualified to distinguish, at least in some sort, the one from the other, to pursue the former and decline the latter, must be also obnoxious to Rewards and Punishments, according as they make a *Right Choice* or a *Wrong*; We may therefore assure ourselves that whatsoever *Matters of Fact Past* have been accompany'd with any *Doctrines* or *Institutions* respecting *Moral Truth or Falshood, Good or Evil*, cannot want a *Criterion* or *Criteria*, according to which we may as certainly determine of their *Truth or Falshood*, as if we had *Mathematical Demonstration*.

For the *History of every such matter of Fact Past*, is either *True* or *False*. If the *Moral Doctrines* recommended, enforc'd, or confirm'd by *such Matter of Fact* were suitable to the good Pleasure of God, 'tis to be concluded, God authoriz'd those *Doctrines* in
such

such a manner; since those extraordinary Matters of Fact, which we now especially consider, are, many of them, not only the *Seal*, but the only *Seal*, by which he might convince Us that he authoriz'd and promulg'd these Doctrines, as I shall more particularly evince to you presently; and if he so established the Moral Doctrines, 'tis not to be question'd but that he has assign'd a *Criterion*, by which we may demonstrate to our selves the Truth of those Matters of Fact, which are the Seal and only Seal possible to those Moral Doctrines authoriz'd by God.

On t'other hand, if the *History of such Extraordinary Matters of Fact* be *False*, unless God has assign'd some *Criterion*, by which we may know *certainly* that they cannot be true, we must ever be left in Doubt as to the Authority of the Moral Doctrines, which such extraordinary Matters of Fact should establish as Divine: Nay, wanting a *Criterion* to distinguish by, we should be oblig'd to conclude that the History of such Extraordinary Matters of Fact is not true, because it is destitute of a *Criterion*, by which we might know it to be so, in order to our receiving those Moral Doctrines, the Authority of which is grounded upon it, for without that *Criterion*, the *History of the Matters of Fact* is left uncertain, and by

con-

consequence it must be also left uncertain, whether the Authority of the Moral Doctrines be Divine, and so those Ends would not be answer'd, which God proposes in establishing the Authority of such Moral Doctrines by the History of such extraordinary Matters of Fact, since no Body can imagin God would propose either Moral Doctrines to be receiv'd, as Divine, unless he saw it *most expedient* that they should be receiv'd as Divine, or that if he saw it *most expedient* that they should be receiv'd as Divine, he would not make the Authority upon which they were receiv'd as *certain* and *evident* as the Moral Doctrines were *expedient*, that is, *most evident*.

It appears therefore that the History of Matters of Fact properly relating to Moral Good or Evil, Truth or Falshood is not without, at least one sure Criterion, and indeed as to the History of those Extraordinary Matters of Fact which have confirm'd the Divine Authority of the Christian Religion, many more Criteria than one have been found, and are to be found, by which the Truth of it is as Demonstrable as of the plainest Problem in *Euclid*. I need only instance in that, which the most acute, most incomparable Author of the *short Method with the Deists* has offer'd, who in the compass of Sixty Two little Pages has drawn up a Proof so
O bright

bright and irresistible, that no Man can possibly evade it, 'till he has divested himself of Common Sense, as well as of his Conscience.

And indeed upon Supposition the Premises are allow'd, *the bare Probability* of Matters of Fact recorded in the sacred Books converts into an absolute *Certainty*. 'Tis most reasonable that when it appears more likely that the World once knew such Matters of Fact than that it did not, we should assent accordingly, and conclude that the History of them is just and true, because God has been pleas'd to make it a Principle, that we should acquiesce in those Reasons which are most pressing. 'Tis more credible that such Persons as *Alexander, Julius Caesar, and Socrates* liv'd heretofore than that They did not: And therefore the Laws of Reason and Comon Sense oblige me to take the former for granted. Not that in those Instances I can be so confident, as in the Matters of Fact related in Holy Scripture, since those Matters of Fact are recorded in Confirmation of Doctrines relating in an eminent Manner to the Divine Attributes and the Moral Duties of Man, and it would be by no means agreeable to the Wisdom and Goodness of God, who can neither in any sort be impos'd upon, or impose upon others, as I have made out above, to suffer the same Probability to ac-

company Matters of Fact recorded in Confirmation of such Doctrines, unless such Doctrines and the Matters of Fact confirming such Doctrines were true; I say, at least the *same Probability*, in regard of which we are by Reason bound to believe any Facts to be true, not recorded in Confirmation of Doctrines relating peculiarly to God's Attributes, or the Moral Duties of Men. No Body, I think, can be so extravagantly mad and silly as to deny that the Facts recorded in Holy Scripture are Facts whereof the Account carries along with it at least a *general Probability*, or to maintain that 'tis rather presumable no such Persons as *Christ Jesus* and his Disciples ever liv'd in the World, asserted such Propositions, wrought such wonderful Works, &c. than the contrary: So that the Account of these Facts consider'd as *Facts in general*, is by the Rule above observ'd to be admitted for *True*. But then this Account is an Account of Facts wherein the Honour of God's Attributes, and the Moral Perfections and Interests of Men are especially concern'd, and therefore every Body may depend upon't, that God, that All-wise, All-good, All-perfect Being would not suffer it to carry such a Probability along with it, as ought to sway us in judging of the Truth of Recorded Facts *in general*, unless both the Account were

true, and the Doctrines confirm'd by the Facts related in that Account were Good and True also. Therefore the Truth of the Account, and the Goodness of the Doctrines are not to be question'd, upon supposition the Arguments for the Truth of the Account were only *in general* more Probable than the Arguments against it, which certainly no Body pretending to any rational Faculties at all, or that has not lost the Use of them, will be so hardy as to deny.

Now I come to perform the Promise I made You, That I would prove the extraordinary and miraculous Matters of Fact recorded in the Holy Scripture, were not only the *Seal*, but the *only Seal* by which God might convince Us, that he authoriz'd and promulg'd those Doctrines which were exhibited to the World along with such Matters of Fact.

That Omnipotence is an Attribute of God has been fully demonstrated elsewhere, (*Philosoph. Essays, Essay 5th*) and that God alone by his Omnipotence can *create new Species of Things*, is a Position undeniable, for if any other Being could *create new Species*, it must have receiv'd its Ability to do so from God, and 'tis not supposable that he shou'd reserve to himself the Creation only of Substances out of Nothing, and not the Modelling, Distributing, Dividing

and Disposing of Substances, so as that *Variety of Species* should arise out of Them. The End of God's creating Substances was undoubtedly to exert and manifest his Glorious Attributes. The digesting of *Substances* into *Kinds*, and *Species* must be a much more remarkable Instance of his exerting and manifesting those Attributes: Indeed an Instance as much more remarkable and significant than the former, as the Visible World in its present Condition is a more lively Indication, and a more forcible Argument of a God and Providence, than a meer *Chaos* would be. The same is to be observ'd of the Immaterial World. To cause a Substance to exist having Three Dimensions, is an Act of Infinite Power, but an Expression of Infinite Wisdom and Goodness by no means comparable to that of forming out of this rude Substance, the great stupendious System of Heaven and Earth, and all the Noble Orders of Material Beings serving and supporting one another in a most exquisite and useful Harmony. Or if the Divine Majesty should, at any time have empower'd a created Being to lay any parcels of Matter together, and so modify'd as to constitute any Species of Beings in Nature, yet all the Virtue, and every Energy of such a created Agent, *immediately* and *absolutely* depends upon God's

Attributes, rendring their Virtues and Energies effectual, which they can no longer be when God discontinues his *Supply of Powers*. The Consequence of all this runs thus, that if the Holy Scriptures afford any Instances of the Creation of Substances or Species wrought without, or by the Instrumentality of Created Agents, God must have been the sole Author of those Miracles. And that the Holy Scriptures afford such Instances, whoever is at all acquainted with 'em must know. *Elisba's* replenishing the Widdow's Cruise, and satisfying an hundred Men with Twenty Loaves, *2 Kings Chap. 4.* and our Blessed Saviour's filling five Thousand Men, beside Women and Children, with five Loaves and two Fishes, *St. Mat. 14.* and, at another time four thousand Men, beside Women and Children with seven Loaves and a few little Fishes, *St. Matth. 15.* are Miracles of this Kind, either the Quantity of the Oil and the Bread being increas'd by additional Matter new-created, or some other distinct Species of Matter *pre-existent* invisibly and imperceptibly converted into Oil and Bread.

Nor may it be objected that the Bodies of the Parties who are said to have been supply'd with this Oil and Bread, were otherwise miraculously sustain'd, and not out of the Substance of that Oil and Bread
which

which might be only Visionary. I appeal to the Relations themselves as deliver'd in the Holy Scriptures; The Oil cou'd not be Visionary, for 'twas such as the Woman and her Children might *live on*, 2 *Kings* 4. v. 7. Nor yet the Bread, for those on whom it was bestow'd did not only see it, but *eat of it*, and *left of it*, 2 *Kings* 4. 43, 44. and, (*St. Mat.* 14. 20. no less than *twelve Baskets full*, and v. 37. *seven Baskets full*).

The Water turn'd into Wine at the Marriage in *Cana* was a Miracle tho not of *simple Creation*, or *Creation out of Nothing*, yet of *Creation of Species*, and therefore cannot, as I have prov'd above, be ascrib'd to any *Author* but God.

Agē, by far the greatest Number of the Miracles recorded in the Holy Scriptures is of *Consummative Miracles*. Among these the Woman's Son restor'd to Life by *Elisba*; 2 *Kings* 4. and the dead Man by *Elisba's* Bones; 2 *Kings* 13. *Lazarus*, &c. by Christ; Himself by the Power of his Divinity; *Dorcas* by *St. Peter*; *Acts* 9. &c. And restoring a dead Body to Life, or any Decay'd and Damnify'd Being to its State of *Natural Perfection*, or *that Perfection which is proper to its Kind*, is an Act most certainly peculiar to the most Wise, most Powerful, most Gracious Divinity, the only and exuberant Fountain of Life, and of all Privileges and Per-

fections to his Creatures. 'Tis absolutely repugnant to the Nature and Constitution of any *Evil* Angels or Powers, even tho they were capacitated, to reinstate any of God's good Creatures when once impair'd or corrupted, in their pristine Circumstances of Life, Strength and Significancy. And although Good Angels are not without ample Faculties, nor deny'd their Province of promoting the Good of the Universe, yet in reducing Things decay'd or perish'd to their *Natural Perfection*, they are no more than Instruments acted by God, and operating under and according to the Influences of his Infinite Power : He it is that gives Sufficiency and Efficacy to the Counsels and Endeavours of those Ministring Spirits, whom he employs to the Benefit of the Universe, and from him they receive all the Means of discharging those Duties, to which they are appointed. Not that I imagin it lies in the Power of any Finite Spirit to raise the Dead. To reunite Soul and Body, so as that the very same Commerce shall be renew'd between them that they were at first created to, is the Province of no other than of him, who establish'd formerly that Commerce between them. A good *Angel* cannot communicate a new Soul to a Carcass out of his own Substance, nor remove the Soul departed
out

out of the State to which God has in his Mercy or Justice adjudg'd it ; Much less an Evil *Angel*, whose malignant Disposition cannot so much as permit him to think favourably of the Resurrection of a Body.

Upon this occasion I might alledge many more Arguments resulting from the bare Nature of the Miracles, as we find an account of them exhibited in the Holy Scriptures : But I desire to be as brief as the Importance of the Question will permit.

Now that these Miracles cou'd not be Phantasm and Illusion, that the Persons suppos'd to have been supply'd with the Accessional Oil and Bread were *really* and *truly* so fed ; That the Water *really* became Wine ; That the dead Bodies did indeed return to Life ; &c. cannot be doubted, because the *Reality* of these Miracles was prov'd and evidenced by the Test of the Majority of so many of the Senses of the Parties who were Witnesses to the Truth of them, as cou'd possibly concur to the proving such Miraculous Matters of Fact. That Oil is real, Substantial Oil, and Bread Real Bread, his *Eyes*, his *Hands*, his *Taste* and *Smell* may satisfy any Man, for his *Ears* will avail him nothing towards this Discovery *directly* and *immediately*. And the Parties that *liv'd upon the Oil*, 2 Kings c. 4. must have *Seen*, *Tasted* and *Touch'd* it, although we shou'd
sup-

suppose they never *smelt* it: And so the Persons who fed on the *Loaves and Fishes*. Here then a Majority of those Sensories by which the Reality of such Facts is capable of being prov'd, attests the truth and certainty of them. So again in the Instance of the Water chang'd into Wine. The Three Senses by which it cou'd be manifested that our Saviour's dead Body was alive again, were *Seeing, Hearing, and Feeling*, and these all concurr'd in confirmation of the reality of his Resurrection. St. Luke 24. St. John 20. although the attestation of the *Two first Senses* had been sufficient. And by those *Two first Senses* at least was prov'd *Lazarus's* Resurrection, St. John 11. ver. 44. and the dead Man's at the gate of *Nain*, St. Luke 7. v. 15. and *Dorcas's*, Acts 9. ver. 41. And utterly inconsistent it must have been with God's Goodness and Veracity upon those Occasions to suffer the Majority of those Senses then employ'd, to be deceiv'd, who has most certainly oblig'd us by the Laws of Right Reason entirely to assent to the Testimony of such a Majority, as I have elsewhere prov'd (*Philosoph. Essays. Ess. 5th.*) The Concurrence of all those Senses by which the Truth of any Fact may be confirm'd is certainly an Over-ruling Evidence; and the preponderating Evidence of a *Majority*, even upon Supposition all those Senses, which

might

might have been consulted, were not consulted, is unexceptionable too, in as much as Right Reason, in Consideration of the Divine Attributes, commands us to be resolv'd and determin'd by such a *Majority*.

Lastly, That the Parties who were present at and witnesses to these Facts, whether Friends to the *Jewish* and *Christian* Pretensions, or Enemies, wou'd not have vouch'd the truth of these Facts as they have done; or wou'd not have forborn to declare and prove the Falsties of them to Mankind, had they been false, has been so frequently and fully demonstrated from the Circumstances, Characters, Inclinations, Interests, &c. of those Witnesses of both Sorts, that a single Line to you upon this Topick wou'd be plainly superfluous.

Yet give me leave to take notice of those Heathen Predictions extant in *Lactantius*, concerning the *Messiah*, because no Body, that I know of, has hitherto observ'd how particularly they were both deliver'd and accomplish'd. I shall not plunge into the Dispute, whether the Body of the *Sibylline Oracles*, as we read 'em at this Day be genuine; or whether *Isaac Vossius's* Word shou'd go farther than *Origen's*; or whether *Dionysius Halicarnassens's* Testimony concerning *Varro*, that he suppos'd even the Oracles of *Sibylla Erithrea* Interpolated, countervails the Concurrent and Extant

Au-

Authority of *Origen*, *Lactantius*, &c. nor whether *Isaac Vossius* deserves to be commended for crediting *Celsus* before *Origen*. For my purpose I think it sufficient that no Body of Common Reason will believe either *Origen*, *Lactantius*, or any other of the *Apologists* wou'd have cited particular Passages out of those *Oracles*, and appeal'd to 'emas they lay, and were known to have been extant before the Birth of *Christ* in the Hands and Books of Heathens, unless those Passages were, at least, acknowledg'd on all Hands to be genuine, and distinguish'd from the *Spurious Acrosticks*; for *Isaac Vossius* himself observes that both *Varro* and *Cicero* distinguish'd with all imaginable ease these *Acrosticks* from the *genuine Lines*. What a ridiculous piece of *Presumption*, not to say *Impudence*, had it been in those Learned and Judicious Fathers to refer their Adversaries for Testimonies to, and Characteristicks of *Christ*, to Records and Predictions, which their Adversaries did not allow as Authentick? or of that Antiquity which the Fathers pretended? Nay *Lactantius* (Lib. 4. *De Verâ sap.*) purposing to anticipate any Scruples that might arise to this Effect, gives the Reader to understand who were his Authors. *His Testimonijs quidem revicti, solent eò confugere, ut aiant, non esse illa carmina Sibyllina, sed a nostris conficta*
atq;

atq; composita. Quod profecto non putabit, qui
Ciceronem Varronemq; legerit, aliosq; veteres ;
qui Erythraam Sibyllam, ceterasq; commemo-
rant ; quorum ex Libris ista Exempla proferi-
mus, qui auctores ante obierunt, quam Chri-
stus secundum carnem nasceretur. “ Some
 “ People, ’tis true, when they are confuted
 “ with these Testimonies, are wont to e-
 “ vade the Force of ’em by asserting that
 “ what we call the Sibylline Verses were
 “ Forgeries and Compositions of our own :
 “ But no Body can be of that Mind, that has
 “ read *Cicero, Varro*, and others of the Anci-
 “ ents, who give us an account of *Sibylla Ery-*
 “ *thraa* and the rest of ’em, and whose Books
 “ we have quoted, and these Authours were
 “ dead before Christ was born in the Flesh.
 I think then it is not to be disputed but the
 Verses quoted by *Lactantius* were of those
 which pass’d for genuine with *Varro*, &c.
 before our Saviour’s Incarnation. But still
 the Matter of ’em might be fetch’d out of
 the Books of the Old Testament. Certain-
 ly not all ; for how then shou’d we ac-
 count for those Apposite Passages which
 they afford, and which are not to be found
 in any of the Books of the Old Testament,
 and which yet were so critically and pun-
 ctually fulfill’d, that ’tis plain, it must have
 been a Prophetick Spirit which foretold
 them ? Thus all the Circumstances of the
 Five

Five Thousand Men's making a Meal upon
the Five Loaves and the Two Fishes are
specify'd in those Verses.

Εἰν ἄρτοις ἅμα πέντε, καὶ ἰχθυέσσι δυοῖσιν
Ἄνδρῶν χιλιάδας ἐν ἐρήμῳ πέντε κορέσῃ,
Καὶ τὰ πεισένοντα λαβὼν μετὰ κλάσματα πάντα
Δώδεκα πληρώσει κοφίνους οἷς ἐλπίδα πολλῶν.

*Five Thousand Men he shall 'ith' Wildernefs
With Five Loaves and Two Fishes satisfy,
Besides Twelve Baskets of the Fragments left,
A sure Foundation for the People's Hope.*

Ἀγεν, τὸς ἀνέμους παύσῃ τε λόγῳ, στρώσῃ δὲ θάλασσαν
Μαινομένην, ποσσὶν ὁρήνης πίσει τε πατήσας.

*His potent Words shall pacify the Winds,
And smoothe the rowling Waves : his daring
Securely tread the Surges.* [Feet

And from another of the Sibylls those Lines.

Κύματα πιζάσῃ, νόσον ἀνθρώπων ἀπολύσῃ,
Ζήσῃ τε θνητῶτα, ἀπάτεται ἄλγεια πολλοῖς,
Ἐκ δὲ μιᾶς πηγῆς ἄρτου κόρος ἔσεται ἀνδρῶν.

*Out of one Source of unexhausted Power
Along the Billows he shall stride, and cure
Diseases, raise the Dead, chase Pain away,
And furnish Men sufficiently with Bread.*

'Tis

2

ness

Left.

470

ring Feet

nes.

ire

ay,

Ti9

thority, so far forth at least as he urg'd it; or how they should be satisfy'd of the Authority of a Book, the Contents whereof were so very remarkable, unless at least, in all probability, so much of it were genuine as the Father quoted, although I am not equally concern'd in vindication of these, because the Quotations run in general Terms, and do not, as the Passages out of the *Sibylline Oracles*, contain particulars not suggested in the Books of the Old Testament. But I cannot overlook the Oracle of *Apollo Milesius* (which also occurs in Book iv. *De Verâ Sapientiâ*) to whom the Question being put whether the *Messiah* of the *Jews*, or the great Prince expected in the World about the time of *Christ's* Incarnation, should be God or Man, he return'd for answer,

Θῆντὸς ἦν κατὰ σάρκα σοφὸς τερατώδεσιν ἔργοις,
 Ἄλλ' ὑπὸ Χαλδαίων κειτῶν ὅπλοις συναλωθεῖς,
 Γόμοις καὶ σκολόπεσι πικρὴν ἀνέτλησε τελευτήν.

*According to the Flesh he mortal was,
 And a wise Worker of strange Miracles,
 But by Chaldean Judges seiz'd with Force,
 And nail'd to's Cross he dy'd a dismal Death.*

Now this Oracle the Father supposes had gain'd Credit in the World : else he wou'd not have taken it for granted, as he does,
 that

that *Apollo hoc veritatem ignorantibus persuasit*, had persuaded the Heathens of the Truth of it. How high a degree then of Madness and Arrogance would it have been to offer these Testimonies as uncontested Means of Conviction, without alleging any Arguments to establish their Validity, unless the Truth and Authority of them had been so generally and freely admitted, that there was no occasion for such Arguments? But I have now neither time nor room to pursue the many proofs of this nature, which I might justly dwell upon, and which very well deserve to be rescu'd out of the hands of our daring *Criticks*.

After these and a thousand more Arguments which 'twere easy to annex in proof of the Truth of *Christian Religion*, what shall we think, my Friend, of the Supercilious Confidence of our *Scepticks* and *Deists*? Had not the Wretches renounc'd all Principles of Common Sense, instead of taxing Priests with *Disimulation* and *Legerdemain*, they would subscribe themselves a Club of *Incorrigible Sots*. They would court the Clergy to infuse a few Rudiments of ordinary Knowledge into their Brains; they would be ashamed of pretending to countermine their *Holy Machinations*, as they speak, and rejoice to have a little *Priest-craft* communicated to themselves; for, in earnest, *First Notions*

P seem

seem almost as necessary, as *Preventing Grace* toward their Reduction; and I am so charitable at present, as to take 'em for a sort of *Insensitive Machines*, that laugh, rally and play the Fool *Mechanically*. Indeed those who plant their Faculties against the Honour of Him who gave them, deserve at least to have 'em *benumm'd* and *suspended*. But (with your Permission, Sir) to descend a little into the Causes of this *Disorder*.

The most general I conceive to be Mistakes about Pleasure and Interest, in which when People are once involv'd, especially if Young and full of Fire and Fancy, nothing serves 'em but over-bearing all Reasonable and Divine Obstructions, and suffocating the very Powers of Thinking rather than they'll endure the Discipline. This they call a *Manumission of their Understandings*, by the same Figure, that the common People make use of to denominate *Slavery Freedom*, when they bring it upon themselves. Accordingly so soon as *Reason's* extinguish'd, and the nobler Properties are voted *Useless Members*, the *Rump of Appetites* and *Passions* immediately seize the Reins, and ride the sorry *Remainders* of the *Microcosm* at Discretion. Hence it follows, I take it, that Old People should not be so generally obnoxious to *Scepticism* as Young; and we may observe that they are not. A

Spring-tide

Spring-tide of *Animal Spirits* easily overflows the *Judgment* before it's grown up. Besides, the *Sollicitations* are repeated every Hour, the *Images* of *Pleasure* crowded upon the *Fancy*, and all the *Senses* attacqu'd at once, so that 'tis impossible to hold out, unless Heaven be apply'd to, and send Forces to raise the Siege. Not but *Avarice* and *Dotage* may sometimes make the *Well-stricken* wish, upon account of certain disagreeable Texts, they could stumble upon a flaw in the proof of their Authority; for the Truth on't is, could every Man find his Vices dispens'd with in God's Word, he would spare his Criticisms and Expostulations, and compound readily enough for *Mysteries*, might he be but excus'd as to *Morals*.

What if an Instance or Two stands upon Record, peradventure among our own Countreymen, and *Moderns*, of *Philosophers*, as they dubb'd themselves, who were not exceptionable on the Score of any *Known* Immoralities? Did not *Self-Conceit*, *Singularity* and the *Pride* of leading up a Sect display themselves throughout their several *Hypotheses*? Some Men's *Leachery* lies toward *Remarkableness*; and *Opinion* is with Pretenders equivalent to *Wine, Women and Wealth*. They take out their *Debauches* in Gratifications of their Vanity, and revel in *Paradoxes* like *Bacchanals*. To make head

against Demonstration, and to stare the Sun out of Countenance——O! these, they conclude, must be unparallel'd Enterprizes. The very Proposal appears *Heroical*, and entitles 'em at least to a distinguishing *Motto*, *In magnis voluisse*, or the like. Undermining of sacred Testimonies and Truths will in the Attempt set Mankind *agoog*. It betrays an *astonishing Hardynefs*. 'Tis bringing the Divine Majesty it self to Strict Examination, a striking at the very Fundamentals of that Order and Oeconomy which God has establish'd in the Universe. Now these Things are not heard of every Day.

But alas! the *Libertine* and the *Philosopher* may e'en shake hands over their Success! The first cannot enjoy his Lethargy always, even on this side his Fate. A checking Principle lies upon his hands in spite of his Teeth: The bare sight of a Bible interrupts the *Charm*. As the *Gray-headed Preceptor*, by the absurdity of his Project, prejudices the People of Sence to his own disappointment, and be the number of his Profelytes more or less, the very Character of 'em both discredits and confutes his Theorems. The Children in the Streets find him out, and pin papers at his Tail. To be short, his Ignominy proves in course as General and as Mortifying, as his Errors Gross and

and Dangerous. The best Compliment he receives is to be saluted the *Apostle of the Beaux*, and unless I'm mistaken, he might write himself a *Dancing Master of Monkeys* to much better Advantage.

If I have detain'd you too long, Sir, the Seriousness of the Occasion bears me out, and to convince you I plead this Excuse fairly, I shall now take leave of my Argument and my Friend together, professing my self his

Most Humble,

&c.

April the
9th. 1799.

O F

GOOD NATURE.

LETTER X.

My Friend,

TH E Favour of a Letter from you obliges me; but the Task you impose much more; for certainly next to the Pleasure of being Good-natur'd, the Contemplation of that admirable Quality (provided Satisfactions of Piety and Devotion toward God, go along with it) is the most Seraphick Entertainment in the World. The *Gusto* of it governs upon the Palat, and every grosser Delight sickens at the first Relish of so divine a Rapture. Effeminacy, Luxury, Lust, Ostentation grow insipid under the Extasy. Malice and Envy lose all their Force, and blush at their own Deformity, when Good Nature encounters them. This is that bright *Astræa*, which as she cannot abide, but in an Heavenly Soul;

so

so makes a golden Age, a *Millennial* State, as it were, where'er she comes. Tranquillity, Friendship, Love, and all the choice Blessings of Endearment she brings along with her; Unknits the contracted Brow; Stops the Flux of the Gall; Silences the Tongue and the Trumpet, and creates Harmony, Smiles, Gaiety, Frankness, in a word all the Charms of Society and Conversation. Nay more, Good Nature is absolutely the best Physick. It sweetens the Blood, corrects the Humours, clears the Head, comforts the Stomach, and cheers the Spirits beyond *Elixers* and *Juleps*. I must not presume much upon my own Experience, but if you will be pleas'd to recollect, I fancy, you will find Few among those ill-natur'd Persons you have met with in the World that have liv'd to a good old Age. 'Tis confessedly the property of Peevishness to macerate the Constitution, vitiate the Juices, and prey upon the Vitals; while Complacency and Freedom have a Virtue in 'em to cure Consumptions and Languors, to make an *Hebe* of an *Anchises*, and give a Flavour to Extremities.

The meanest Degree of Good Nature displays it self in Expressions of *Common Civility*, and yet as slight an Instance of it as we take this to be, Three Parts in Four of Mankind are not advanc'd so far. I do

not expect every Body I happen to converse with should understand and practice all the Ceremonies and Formalities of the Court, make his Leg like a Dancing-Master, and come up to a Gentleman of the *Bed-Chamber* at Complimenting. These are nauseous Civilities, as offensive as *Musk* to the Brain. They turn the offices of Humanity into a *Drama*, and the Simplicity of good Neighbourhood into *Superstition*. But yet a decent Observance and mutual Respect, one wou'd imagin, we might make sure of. These are a necessary Part of general Commerce, and as easy as necessary. They chiefly consist in our Language and Address. Now we must be very Untoward indeed, if it costs us more pains to use Obliging than Disobliging Expressions. Does *your Humble Servant*, or *my Respects to you, Sir*, fret the Tongue in the pronouncing? Certainly not, unless 'tis fester'd beforehand. A gracious Dialect is ever the most fluent: as on t'other hand, I have observ'd Conumelious Terms to be least Manageable and *Mouthable*. For if the very Syllables are not rugged, as in the Words *Bastard* and *Rascal*, yet the Emphasis which Passion strikes, puts the Lips and Tongue, and all the Organs of Speech into Convulsions. 'Tis a Judgment upon those People who cannot form their Mouths to good Language, that they

they were not born Dumb. What an unaccountable Piece of precise Barbarity then is it in some Men to make Common Civility a Damnable Sin? as if paying a just Deference to those Images God has created of himself, were as foul Idolatry as worshipping the Golden Calf.

The next advance in good Nature is to *Condescension* and *Officiousness*. We must fetch our Tempers to a Pliancy, accustom our selves to neglect the Provocations, connive at the Failures, and close with the Desires of Those we have to deal with; we must abridge our selves in the lesser Conveniences and Opportunities of Life to gratify the little Curiosity and Longings of Others. And we should not think it hard to recede from such an inconsiderable Portion of our Natural Liberty, but that we do not consider the Conveniences of the Effect, and how much we receive *per Cent.* Interest for our Self-Denial. Eminence of Character and Condition, we presume, ought to outweigh all extrinsecal Considerations, or if this Pretence be wanting, 'tis ten to one but we think we have it, and that's the same Thing. Hereupon we indulge our selves in a Supercilious Perverseness, we grow Mathematical in our admission of Familiarities, and chalk out every Man his Line of Distance. We forget our own Miscarriages

ages and Defects, and aggravate the slightest Omissions of our Neighbours.

*At Pater ut gnati, sic nos debemus amici,
Si quod sit vitium, non fastidire.*

But this is not all: We are to *way-lay* Occasions of serving him. 'Tis not enough to stand clear of his Displeasure. It lies upon us to observe the Circumstances of his Concerns, and improve every fair Possibility of obliging him. To be lazy when it lies in my Power to do a Courtesy, is little better than to be active in promoting of Mischief. I know of Nothing that can excuse or palliate our Neglect, but when the Proceeding wou'd be dishonourable, or the Party to be seconded appears undeserving. Not that we are to undertake above our Strength, or strip our selves to the Skin in favour of another Man's Wardrobe. For although his Occasions be the Motive, they must not be the Measure of my Alacrity. To find that I must examin the Vigour of my Constitution, and the Terms of my Leases. He that will be Good-natur'd before his Stock's apprais'd is in danger of making himself a Vassal and a Beggar, to purchase at last the Character of a Fool for his Forwardness. Nevertheless from many Condescensions, the lowest Ebb of Condition will

will not acquit us. We can put up our Prayers and Good Wishes when 'tis out of our Power to act, and have then most reason to think we shall be heard. Further: *Compassion* is a main Ingredient of Good Nature. 'Tis the most taking, most endearing Quality imaginable; so prevailing, that I have often seen a Quarrel made up at the News of a third Party's Misfortune. The Contention immediately shifted it self into a League of Commiseration, and like Contrary Principles by the Means of a Chymical *Menstruum*, the Resentments on both sides embody'd, and generated a Good Understanding. Yet some Men have pronounc'd Compassion a Weakness of Nature; Thanks to the Weakness of their own Judgment. For should I not much rather conclude that the Rational Part has the Animal under Command, when the Apprehension so readily makes the Heart expand it self, and the Tears overflow to the Mortification of our *Sensitive Half*? Altho I confess the Intellectual Pleasure arising from a Sense of Pity is very exquisite. An Intimate Acquaintance not long since told me, that the Story in *Eusebius* of *St. John*, and the Young *Libertine*, had cost him many a *Delicious Shower of Tears*. But an industrious Compassion is yet more excellent. Our Compliments of Condolence ought to bring up
Re-

Relief in the Rear : if they do not, they're but Good Poetry at the best. 'Tis confess'd indeed this Tenderneſs of Nature may be too far indulg'd, as it is when it lays us at the Mercy of every Tragical Report, and puts it in the Power of every Tatling Coxcomb to make us miſerable. It ought ever to be attended with a Preſence of Mind, and Readyness of Recollection, and not to tranſgreſs the Proportion and Analogy of the Calamity, becauſe the Exceſs will neceſſarily favour either of Littleneſs or Affectation, the latter of which is in this Caſe eaſily diſtinguiſhable from the former, Compaſſion being hard to imitate. *Pateneſs and Tears at Call*, is reckon'd the Top of the Play-Houſe Art. Tho in my Opinion the Acquiſition ſhould have as much of Difficulty as it has Little of Credit in't, for as untractable as we find our Conſtitutions in moſt reſpects beſide, we generally find them yielding enough to Impreſſions of Pity. The Maſs of Blood muſt be ſtagnated, and the Heart petrify'd, if the Miſfortunes of our Fellow Creatures cannot move us. Nay we ſeem to miſunderſtand our own Concerns when we betray ſuch an Inſenſibility. 'Tis as much as to ſay, we have forgot that we are a Party in the Creation, and intereſted in the Polity of the Universe ; as if we conceiv'd the World to be ſuch a diſ-joynted *Machine*, or

at

at least the Concernments of Men so independent of One Another, that Injuries offer'd to the *Antipodes* could not affect us here ; whereas 'tis almost false Logick to suppose *Mankind* a Number of Individuals. Necessitude and Relation have made *one entire Lump* of the Order, in so much that, as it were a *Nerve*, one Extremity is no sooner offended but t'other labours.

A higher Pitch of Good Nature is to suppress Resentment, a Quality as easy to be begot in us by a view of Human Frailties, as Compassion by a Sense of Human Calamities. And as much greatness of Spirit as we attribute to our selves upon the Consciousness of an Impatient and Exceptionous Temper, were it possible for us in that Juncture to reflect upon our Infirmities within, we should find foreign Provocations more pardonable than our own Petulancy. This, upon supposition we were competent Judges of other Men's Meanings and Motives, and Masters of so much Impartiality, and so nimble an Apprehension as to set up for our own Arbitratours, and interpret People's Words e'r they have explain'd 'em themselves. But to make the worst of Matters ; what if a Coxcomb lies under a *Flux* of Impertinence ? Will a Man of solid Notions rave at a *Pismire* for stinging his Legs ? He may be allow'd to wish
the

the Smart over, but if he cannot be compos'd 'till he has brought the little *Rapparee* to condign Punishment, he deserves to sit from Morning to Night in the Stocks over an *Ant-hill*. If 'tis worth while to take notice of the Affront, the By-standers will, at least tacitly, resent it, and the more for my Indifference: but if not, I shall render it a Substantial Ignominy, by the trouble of the Application and Challenging of Satisfaction. Or should I in the Eyes of the Ranting Gentlemen appear somewhat too Tame, the Inconveniences avoided must have prov'd much worse, and the Glory too of being Wiser than my Neighbours had been lost. You'll say then, does Philosophy oblige us to be entirely resign'd and absolutely insensible under the most-Contumelious Treatment? By no means. But it obliges me to choose a proper Season, and a Legal Method, to weigh every Circumstance, the original of the Quarrel, my own Behaviour, my Adversarie's Constitution and Parts, and among other things, not to let the greatest Indignities from a Fool so much disturb me, as the least from a Man of Sense. Thus we shou'd reduce the Grounds of Contention to a very small Number, and thereby mightily contract the Expences of our own Quiet.

Or

Or if we cannot hold our Tongues, however we may hold our Hands, which, as mettlesom as most of our Sparks may be, they are all ty'd to by the Tenour of their own Maxims. 'Tis a Rule of Honour, they grant, that the more Able should not engage with the less Able. Very good! Now then let 'em produce me a Couple exactly match'd for Skill and Strength if they can. Honour is *mathematically* nice, and the most inconsiderable Disproportion comes within their own Limitations. Providence has so wonderfully wrought a Dissimilitude in the Forces of Men no less than in their Features, as on purpose to turn the *Golden Rules* of these Ranters upon themselves, so that if they'll vow to live peaceably 'till they're *critically* pair'd, I dare say, the Philosophers are willing to put the Cause upon that Issue. But Good Nature prefers the more generous Inducements. It remembers that the Ends of Punishment are either Preventional, Emendatory, or Exemplary; that they are either to hinder the Commission of Enormities, Work a Reformation, or Deter other People; and also apprehends that none of these are attainable by the Process of a private Revenge; that if the Insolence be Unpardonable, there lies an Appeal to the Authority of the Magistrate; but if pardonable, an Act of Oblivi-

on is due to the Delinquent. If it entertains any Partiality, it points it all against it self, is jealous of its Defectiveness, and indeed had rather lay the blame at its own Door than at another's. This is that τὸ εἶναι πρῶτον πλημμελεῖν which *Democratizes* the *Pythagorean* calls μεγαθυρίη, a true Majesty of Soul. This preserves us perfectly Inoffensive, and makes him ridiculous that dares offer at an Abuse. In short, this is the gentle Disposition we should all be of, did we not with our Improvements and Acquisitions imbibe a Tincture of Conceit, which makes us more or less distinguish our selves from every Member of our Species beside. Here lies the Root of the Vindictive Principle. For, I beseech you! If I feel my self singularly Wise, will you blame me, Sir, if I erect a *Commonwealth* within my own Person? Alas! my Faculties are much more than sufficient to administer the whole grand Oeconomy. My Apprehension's a *Witness*, my Judgment a *Jury*, and my Will as notable an *Executioner*, believe me, as the best in the World. So stands the Case when Pride and Conceit once get the Ascendant.

Beside the Concurrence of the good Qualities we have been descanting upon, to the Completion of Good Nature, or rather the Illustration of it, a Gaiety and Airyness

of

of Humour may come in as an Appendage. Not that this is an *Essential*, Jollity or Severity of Temper depending chiefly upon the Habit of the Body, and being almost accidental. But yet we ought to struggle with our Malady, and 'tis Forty to One but the Awkwardness of our Endeavours makes better Diversion than if we were *Wilfully Frolicksome*. To see an old Friend at odds with himself, and baiting his *Mechanism* with his *Reason* must surprize no less than honest *Sofia's* Expostulations with his other *Self*. And who knows? The *Spleen* (may I say any Thing of it after Mr. *Collier*?) is a sort of *Impostume*. If a *Monkey* can cure the one, our own Ridiculousness, 'tis to be hop'd, will cure t'other. But there's the Mischief, this Disorder has as much of the *Incubus* in't as the *Impostume*. There's no Man feels the Oppression, but wou'd be glad to have it gone, and is angry with himself for wanting *Power to move*. However, *Nil ego contulerim jucundo sanus amico*. *Pleasantry* is a most suitable Garnishing to Good Nature, a most excellent Vehicle to communicate it in, for when 'tis muffled up with Clouds and Gloominess it may be Real and true Sterling, but the World will be apt to mistake it for its Opposite, and unless we can command a little Mirth in our Eyes, 'twill be necessary

to keep an Interpreter of our Looks. A chearful *Confident* or Two will put us in a way, or if we should prove Indocil, however the *Musick-Masters* may entertain their Scholars with Lessons they cannot teach 'em.

On t'other side, 'tis our Duty to be cautious, and confine our Good Nature within the Liberties of Religion and Sobriety. There must be no deserting of Principles, nor admitting of Excesses to curry Favour. He that expects I shou'd yield so far, merits worse at my Hands than a bare Disappointment. When Matters are once come to such a pass, 'tis time to grow warm, and I cannot manifest a kind meaning so well as by the Severity of a Rebuke: for if Criminal Compliances are included in the Definition of Good Nature, Bauds and Prostitutes may in time engross the Property.

I could pursue the present Subject, Sir, with Pleasure; but being unexpectedly interrupted, hardly obtain a moment to profess my self,

Sir,

Your &c.

October the
23. 1699.

P A R E N.

PARENTALIA.

LETTER XI.

Sir,

THAT MS. of my Father's, which you desire to peruse, lies at present in the Hands of a Third Person ; but so soon as 'tis return'd, you may command the Use of it. As to that other Part of your Letter, wherein you seem concern'd upon the account of certain *Objections* and *Invectives*, particularly in Some of our most Modern Writers against the Author of that MS. and because they have not as yet been taken into Consideration, your good Intentions are extremely Obliging ; but, I think, you must necessarily be sensible, the World at this Juncture is hardly *Compos* enough to understand rightly any Vindications of that Author. However, because you wish'd those few Pages of the *Origines Britannicæ* containing certain Articles against *Religion* and *Loyalty* might come under Examination,

Q 2

I have

I have endeavour'd, as in Duty bound, to satisfy my self of the State of the Case; and when I have offer'd you my poor Observations upon those Pages, shall go on to acquaint you with my Opinion of Two or Three Reflecting Passages beside, as they came elsewhere in my way. Not that I reckon my self a competent Judge of every Dispute or Argument, wherein your Friend was engag'd; nor that I ever expect to be so: but yet I do not suppose my self utterly incapable of comparing Narrations with Narrations, and so determining the Truth of plain Matter of Fact; or at least of confuting Assertions out of those very Propositions, which the Assertour himself has laid ready to my Hands.

You expect perhaps I should upon this Occasion attempt the Character of your Friend deceas'd; but I am in all respects unqualify'd for that Province. For, not to mention my Personal Incapacity, I lie under Obligations, as on one Hand, of omitting Miscarriages and Faults, so on t'other of declining even just Encomiums. To discover and expose the Frailties of Parents is Undutiful; to do Justice to their Merits might seem Immodest. Only, thus much I may say, and certainly without Offence, that put the worst Construction upon Matters, had not the World in the particular
Case

Case of your Friend, inverted its own Measures of Estimation and Censure, it would at least have excus'd some few Failures in consideration of many recommending Qualities ; while in the Case of some Others whom it admir'd with a most zealous Partiality, it suffer'd it self to dote upon a great many bad Qualities for the sake of a few pretty good Ones *Misemploy'd*. How singularly ambitious the Party I am concern'd for shew'd himself to serve the Publick, with what Pleasure he settled to those Studys, by which he might most benefit the Church and State, whereof he was a Member, and with how constant an Application he pursu'd them in Despight of perpetual Discouragements, and the Witty Malice of very formidable Factions, I need not intimate. All his Friends knew it well enough ; his Enemies *too well*. And if 'twas his Infelicity (for no Body, I presume, will make it *his* Fault) to have had his tender Years season'd with Untoward Principles, yet that he so readily became sensible of those Errours to which he had been prejudic'd from his Cradle, was not, I think, more his Happiness and Glory, than an Evidence of his Sincerity. And I have wonder'd some Gentlemen should call his relinquishing those Tenets, which themselves had *pretended* to oppose, and his

Q 3 espousing

espousing that Cause, for which themselves had declar'd, an Argument of Disingenuity and Levity. Strange ! that Men of Understanding shou'd not distinguish their best Friends from their worst Enemies, but discharge their whole Artillery upon *Detachments of their own* ! for as for the Plebeian Rout, if some of his Adversaries had valu'd themselves no more upon their Acclamations than he disturb'd himself for their Misrepresentations, they had really been just as humble as they ought to have been. He knew he might as well have blam'd *Phalaris's Bull*, as the Mobb, for *Bellowing*. Experience had taught him that Noise, Ignorance, and Calumny are among their *Essentials*, and Humanity and Prudence, Things absolutely repugnant to their Natural Constitutions ----- But I forget myself.

'Tis incumbent upon the next of Blood to erect a Monument in Memory of the Defunct. I wish I cou'd discharge this Duty in every Sense. But tho' 'tis out of my Power to raise your Friend a Monument, it's not utterly out of my Power to do some kind Offices to his Memory. As for my present Task, the Author of *Religion* and *Loyalty* has render'd it easy by the Clearness of his own Consequences, which makes me wonder, I confess, how a Per-

son

son so Judicious and Acute, as the late Learned Author of *Origines Britannica*, dreamt he had found out those gross Errours and Inconsistencies which he has been pleas'd to fasten upon the Author of *Religion and Loyalty*. Upon what Provocations he thus happen'd to overshoot himself, I will not, or rather need not enquire. But am sorry to find his Remarks so very Vehement and Exculcerated. I meet with nothing in the First or Second Part of *R.* and *L.* that concern'd his *Person*, unless where the *Henoticon* is nick-nam'd an *Irenicum*. And why he shou'd take that *Irenicum* to himself I do not see. For it was either such an *Irenicum* as he liked or disliked. If the first, why did he express an Uneasyness at the Comparison? If the latter, why did he make it his own, when no Body else had made it so? But to hasten to the Merits of the Cause. The Author of *Religion and Loyalty* had asserted, (Part I. p. 354.) "that the
 " *Arian* Faction was wholly suppress'd by
 " the *Nicene* Council, and all the Tumults
 " that were made after that, were owing
 " to the *Eusebians*, who were as forward as
 " the Orthodox to anathematize the *Arians*;
 " and all the Persecutions in the Reign of
 " *Constantius* were rais'd by their Unseason-
 " able Tampering, Prudence and Modera-
 " tion; that they (the *Eusebians*) never in

“ the least appear’d after the Council of Nice
 “ in behalf of the *Arian* Doctrine, (Part I.
 “ p. 374.) but their whole Fury was bent
 “ against the Word *ὁμοούσιος* and *Athanasius* ;
 “ that in the time of *Constantius* and *Con-*
 “ *stans* the cause of *Arius* was wholly lay’d
 “ aside by both Parties, (p. 415.) and the
 “ only Contest was about the Word *ὁμοούσιος* ;
 “ that the *Eusebian* Cause was not to restore
 “ *Arianism*, (p. 468.) but to piece up the
 “ Peace of the Church by Comprehending
 “ all in one Communion, or by mutual For-
 “ bearance. To all these Assertions the *Origines*
 oppose as contradictory, the following Asser-
 tions from R. and L. “ *Valens*, *Ursacius*, and
 “ their Associates had been secret *Arians* all
 “ along. The word Substance was left out
 “ of the third *Sirmian* Creed, to please *Va-*
 “ *lens* and his Party ; who being embol-
 “ den’d by this Creed, whereby they had
 “ at length shaken off the Clogs that had
 “ been hitherto fasten’d on them, to hinder
 “ their Return to *Arianism*, mov’d at the
 “ Council of *Ariminum* , that all former
 “ Creeds might be abolish’d, and the *Sirmi-*
 “ *an* Creed establish’d for ever, P. 484, 508,
 510. Now how is it possible, if we may believe
 the *Origines*, to reconcile this Enemy to the
 Design of Reconcilers to himself? (Or. 147.)
 How but by annexing a few Lines which
 wou’d easily have explain’d the proper Sense
 of the Passages he has quoted, if the Author
 of

of the *Or.* had pleas'd to take notice of 'em ? As in the first Quotation (*R. and L. p. 354.*) these words omitted by the Authour of the *Or.* But then they must have the Decree of the *Nicene Council* reverst, and what work they made about it we shall see, when we come to the *Reign of Constantius*, would have made it clear that the Authour of *R. and L.* meant the same as before, *p. 305.* That *tho'* after the *Herésie* it self was vanquish'd by the *Nicene Council*, the *Hereticks*, or rather their *Friends*, created him infinite Troubles about it by oblique Arts, and for other Ends; yet they durst never own the *Herésie* it self, not only in his time, but in all the time of his Son *Constantius* 'till the end of his *Reign.* I hope the Learned Authour of the *Or.* knew how to distinguish between *Hereticks* profess, and profess *Friends* of *Hereticks*; between openly owning an *Herésie*, and secretly promoting it. Agen, but that he cou'd not spare time, he should have cast his Eye over the next Page after his Second Quotation, where the Authour of *R. and L.* declares, that the *Eusebian Quarrel* with *ὁμοιοῦς*, and *Athanasius*, was with a design to leave out the *Nicene Faith*: So to his third Quotation he might have subjoin'd the words which follow. *Whether it* (viz. the word *ὁμοιοῦς*) *ought to be cashier'd as offensive, because unscriptural as the Eusebians contended, or to be preserv'd as a necessary Defence against the Arian Herésie.*

*ſie, as Athanaſius and his Friends truly main-
 tain'd, (R. and L. Part I. p. 415, 416.) It
 ſhou'd ſeem then, the Authour of R. and L.
 ſuppos'd the defending of the Term *ἀποκρίσις*
 againſt the Eusebians, was neceſſary for the
 keeping out of Arianism. Once agen, had
 the Authour of the Or. perus'd a few lines
 beyond his fourth Quotation (P. 469.) he
 muſt have perceiv'd that the Authour of R.
 and L. affirms P. 398. *whatever was at bot-
 tom, it is evident the Arian Heresy it ſelf
 in all the Eusebian Controverſy never ap-
 pear'd at top, i. e. cou'd never openly appear,*
 for that he did not think the ſecret Cauſe
 of *Arianism* defeated in or even a long time
 after *Constantius's* Reign, appears from his
 Words in Part the 2d p. 197. *It was really
 Honorius's Reign, that vanquiſht all the
 Inveterate Disorders of the Church, that utter-
 ly rooted out the Schism of the Donatists, and
 broke the Heart of the Heresy of the Arians,*
for it was at this time that it receiv'd its fatal
blow, though afterward it made ſome weak Ef-
ſays and fainting Gasps to recover life: and
 to the ſame purpoſe, P. 103. Pt. 2. where
 he ſays, that there were *Arians* all along,
 but denies that they own'd themſelves to be
ſuch. Who is it then that has deny'd the Arian
Faction to have been totally ſuppreſt while the
Eusebians remain'd? Or. p. 147. and where-
 in, I would gladly know, lies the Impoſ-
 ſibility for the ſame Perſon to ſay, that af-
 ter*

ter
 app
 the
 yet
 put
 nif
 and
 for
 bot
 tha
 ſeer
 the
 the
 we
 De
 and
 Ter
 cau
 Gor
 Th
 to
 tha
 the
 app
 aſm
 aſte
 ſtar
 Obl
 on,
 ble
 this

ter the *Nicene* Council, they never openly appear'd in behalf of the *Arian* Doctrine in the Eastern and Western Churches: and yet when they, i. e. the *Acacians* at *Antioch* put off all Disguise, they declar'd for *Aetianism*, and consequently for *Arianism*? R, and L. p. 528. Were their Numbers so formidable, as they stood in Opposition both to the Orthodox and the *Eusebians*, that upon their account *Arianism* shou'd seem to have flourish'd in the World after the *Nicene* Council? or did they profess themselves *Arians*, otherwise than as they were *Aetians*? And wou'd any Body call a Deist a Socinian, because he inclusively and illatively has embrac'd the Socinian Tenets? or an Atheist a Presbyterian, because he rejects *all Authority for Episcopal Government*? But to make Matters plainer, That Man wou'd not, I presume, be said to broach Contradictions, who asserted that upon the Restoration of King *Charles* the 2d Heresy, Faction, &c. were in all appearance totally suppress'd, that Enthusiasm and Anarchy durst not for some time after look abroad barefac'd, but notwithstanding that the Good Old Cause was by Oblique and Clandestine Artifices carry'd on, and by some People under very plausible endearing Pretences too. And is not this Instance exactly parallel to that which
the

the Author of the *Or.* loads with such a charge of Repugnancy and Contradiction? But he will make it appear, that the *Arian Faction* was still busy, and active after the *Nicene Council*; that the Contest about *ομολογιος* was with a Design to overthrow the *Nicene Faith*; that the *Eusebians* great Business was if possible to restore *Arianism*, (*Or. p. 147.*) as if any Body ever deny'd it. The question was, whether *Arianism* after the Council of *Nice* prevail'd abroad, and reign'd openly in the World. The Author of the *Or.* himself in this very Passage takes the Contrary for granted, unless the *Arian Faction* cou'd be busy and at work to destroy the *Nicene Faith*, and restore *Arianism*, and at the same time *Arianism* flourish, and not want to be restor'd. The Word *ομολογιος*, he says, was not the Bottom of the Quarrel. That's not the Question, but whether it was the declar'd Subject of the Quarrel. 'Till therefore better Premisses for his purpose are found, I think, it will rather follow that some Mens Love than that other Mens Hatred of Prudence and Moderation is beyond their Skill and Judgment in the History of the Church. (*Or. p. 147.*) And indeed to put the Matter out of Dispute that the Author of *R.* and *L.* was in the Right, the Author of the *Or.* has himself acknowledg'd and prov'd, (*Or. p. 150*) that the *Arian Faction* after the Council

Council of Nice despair'd to carry any Thing by fair Means, and seem'd for the present to be totally suppress; that Constantia's Chaplain, a Secret Arian whisper'd into the Emperour's Ear very kind things concerning Arius, and his Adherents; that Arius and Euzoius by their specious Confession of Faith made the Emperour believe that Arius (even Arius himself) was of the same Mind with the Nicene Fathers, only leaving out the word Consubstantial, that the Bishops met at Jerusalem unanimously approv'd the Confession of Faith, which Arius had given at the Emperour's Command, and wrote a Circular Letter upon it for receiving Arius and his Adherents into Communion; that the Nicene Faith had the great Advantage of a very publick Settlement, and a general Consent thro' the Christian World, and therefore the Generality were to be cheated into Arianism under other Pretences; that at the Council of Antioch the secret Arians made vehement Protestations, that they were no Followers of Arius, and that they embrac'd none but the antient Faith, asserting the Coeternity of the Son with the Father, and owning the Son to be God of God, &c. that Constantine would suffer no Alteration to be made in the Nicene Faith; and therefore the secret Arians were forc'd to carry on their Design under other Pretences;

tes; that Eusebius and Theognis under the Pretext of embracing the Nicene Faith, did more Mischief than otherwise they cou'd have done; that no body would have imagin'd the Eusebians, who rejected such as said the Sun was made of Nothing, or of another Hypostasis, and not from God, to have been any other than very sound Orthodox Men, especially when Three Years after they anathematiz'd those who held three Gods, or that Christ was not God, or that he was begotten of any other Substance beside God; that the Eusebians in Constantius's Reign saw it necessary at present to seem Orthodox, that so they might the better set aside the Council of Nice, which being once effected, it would be an easy Matter to set up Arianism; that the secret Arians cover'd over their Design with fair Pretences of Peace and Reconciliation, and that it is apparent by the whole Series of the Story, as himself has faithfully deduc'd it, that altho the whole design of the Arian Party was to overthrow the Authority of the Council of Nice, yet they were never able to compass it by a general Council, 'till that of Ariminum. (Or. p. 151, 152, 154, 164, 169, 174.) And now, Sir, do you not observe how effectually he has prov'd against the Author of R. and L. that most material Proposition which he threaten'd to prove, that some Mens hatred

to

to Prudence and Moderation is beyond their Skill and Judgment in the History of the Church? And what if it were? does the proving that Proposition deserve so many pages in *Folio*? Or what if it did? does the proving after the Author of *R.* and *L.* (not to say *out of him*) the very same things that he proves, argue *Lovers* of Prudence and Moderation to be better vers'd in Ecclesiastical History than *Haters*? But it seems it made the Learned Author of the *Or.* mighty merry, his finding it hardly possible to reconcile to himself so great an Enemy to the Design of Reconcilers. (*Or.* p. 174.) Is it not then much more pleasant to find that so great a *Friend* to the Design of Reconcilers, has made it impossible to reconcile Himself to Himself, unless by reconciling Himself to the Author of *R.* and *L.*? Hard Terms of accommodation indeed! and rather than accept of 'em, *Socrates* must not be allow'd to *penetrate into the Depth of the Arian Designs*, and *Athanasius* is made to contradict himself, being first produc'd as attesting the Sway and Triumphs of *Arianism* under *Constantius*, yet soon forgetting himself, and telling us those whom he calls *Arians*, i. e. such consequentially and in their Hearts, *were not such Fools as to own that their chief Design was to take away the Force of the Council of Nice*, (*Or.* p. 174.)

p. 174.) I profess one wou'd think by this manner of Quoting such a Person took a particular Pleasure not only in contradicting *Athanasius*, but in making him contradict himself! (Or. p. 873.) for in that very Epistle *De Syn. Arim. & Seleuc.* to which the Author of the Or. has appeal'd, speaking of the Introduction to the Creed of *Valens, Ursacius, Germinius, &c.* which begun with ἐξέτιθη ἡ καθολικὴ πίσις, &c. ὑπατῆρ Φλαυῖν, Εὐσεβίου, καὶ Ὑπατίου καὶ λαμπροτάτων. He calls it not the *Arian* Confession, altho indeed Ἰσὺν τῆς Ἀριανῆς αἰρέσεως· οὕτω γὰρ γράψαντες, ἔδειξαν, πότε μὲν ἤρξαντο πιστεύειν αὐτοῖς, ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ νῦν βέλονται πρὸς πίσιν αὐτῶν καταγγέλλουσι, and immediately after avers it of *Valens, Ursacius*, and their Party, that ἔτσι γράψαντες, ἐξέτιθη νῦν ἡ πίσις, ἔδειξαν ὅτι νεώτερον ἐστὶ τὸ τῆς αἰρέσεως αὐτῶν φρόνημα καὶ ἐκ τῶν πρότερον. Did *Arianism* begin at the Council of *Ariminum*? Was it not ever known in the World before? If it was, 'tis plain it cou'd not be properly and manifestly the τὸ τῆς αἰρέσεως φρόνημα which *Valens, Ursacius, &c.* profess, for of that St. *Athanasius* says, that it was νεώτερον καὶ ἐκ τῶν πρότερον. He pretended to no more than very just grounds of Suspicion, and in the beginning of the Epistle affirms, that they knew not what they would have themselves; and afterwards in his *Prosopopæia*, where he introduces 'em hatching Variety of Mis-

chiefs

chiefs, and particularly, τὰ ἔν Νικαίᾳ περ-
θέντα χολάσαι ποιήσωμεν, σχηματιζόμενοι τῷ ἀπλότητι
τῶν περχθέντων παρ' ἡμῶν, he adds immediately,
ταῦτα δὲ οἱ καὶ μὴ τοῖς ῥήμασιν αὐτοῖς ἐβήκασιν, ἀλλὰ
τῇ διανοίᾳ ταῦτα πάντα πεποιήκασι τε καὶ διετάραξαν.

'Tis plain therefore they durst not declare
for *Arianism*; nay, 'tis notorious that in
their Creed, which St. *Athanasius* has given
us at length in this very Epistle they profess'd,

πιστεύομεν εἰς ἓνα μονογονῆ υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, ὃ πρὸ πάντων τῶν
αἰώνων, &c. γεννημένον ἀπαθῶς ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, &c. θεὸν ἐκ
θεοῦ, ὁμοιον τῷ γενήσαντι αὐτὸν πατρὶ κατὰ τὰς ἁρὰς

&c. Looks all this like asserting the Son of
God to be a Creature? Does it not, if un-
derstood without Equivocation, imply the
very *Homoïan* Doctrine it self? 'Twould
over-swell my Letter, were I to set down at
length all the Passages which in Ecclesiasti-
cal History confirm the Assertion of the Au-
thor of R. and L. and therefore, Sir, I shall
only refer you to some of the most Pertin-
ent and Express, viz. *Eusebius* and *Theog-
nis's Libellus Penitentiae*, extant both in *Soc-
rates* and *Sozomen*, wherein they particu-
larly declare of themselves, ἡμεῖς καὶ τῇ πίστει

συνεστέμεθα, καὶ τῷ ἔννοιαν ἐξετάσαντες ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοούσιῳ
ὅλοι ἐγνώμεθα τὴν αἰρήνην, οἱ μηδὲμὶ τῇ αἵρεσει ἐξακολου-
θήσαντες. *Arius* and *Euzoïus's Libellus Pæni-
tentiae* to the Emperour, extant also both in
Socr. and *Soz.* and to the same Effect the
Two Creeds in *Socr. c. 10. L. 2.* beside *Mar-*

ius's Creed, Theodor. Lib. 2. c. 30. and other
 Creeds in *Socr. L. 2. c. 30.* But because the
 Author of the *Or.* had a special regard to
 the Authority of *Theodorit*, let's observe
 what that Historian has recorded of the *Euse-
 bians*, *L. 2. c. 18.* ἔφασκον ὅ μὴ χρῆναι τοῖς ἐνε-
 καλίξεον, (εἰσία & ὁμοῖοις) καὶ τέταν ἀρχαίων, διαπα-
 ρῆναι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τὸ σωμαὶ ἀλλ' ὅτι μὴ μὴ ὁμοίον τὸ μ-
 νημόντι τὸ ὅν κατὰ πάντα. τὸ δὲ τὸ εἰσία παρελπίων ὡς
 ἀρχαίον ὄνομα. 'Tis true the *Eusebians* were in-
 wardly ambitious of reviving *Arianism*, their
 secret Intentions and Wishes doubtlesly ten-
 ded that way ; However in their Professions
 they represented themselves as Orthodox, still
 denying the Necessity, and excepting against
 the use of the Term *ὁμοῖοις*. But as detestable
 as their Designs, and as Impious as their Opi-
 nions were, how was it possible for the Au-
 thor of the *Or.* to know their Minds when in-
 deed they knew not their own Minds them-
 selves? Both *St. Athanasius* and *Socrates*
 have observ'd as much, and 'tis grounded
 upon Matter of Fact. Ματαποιῶσι τὴν πίσιν
 (says *Socr.*) εἰδὲν μὲν τῶν ἐν νικαίᾳ μεμψάμενοι τὸ δὲ
 ἀληθὲς, ὅτι καθαιρέσει καὶ παρετρῆν τὸ ὁμοῖοις πίσει,
 διὰ τὸ σωεχθῆς ποιῆσαι σωόδους καὶ ἄλλοτε ἄλλως ὑπαγο-
 ρεύειν τὸν ὅρον τὴν πίσει, ὥστε καταβραχὺ οἷς τὴν ἀρετὴν
 εἶξαν παρετρέψωσι. *L. 2. c. 10.* To the same Ef-
 fect *Eustathius* in his Confutation of *Ari-
 anism* (See *Theodorit. L. 1. cap. 8.*) οἱ δ' ἀρε-
 τμανίται δόξαντες, μήπως ἄρα τοιαύτης ἐν ταυτῇ συνό-

δε συγκεκροτημένης ἐξουσιασθεῖν, ἀταξισταί τε καὶ
 προσηλύτοι τὸ ἀπηγορευμένον δόγμα, συμφώνοις ῥήμα-
 σιν υπογράφαντες αὐτοχρεῖ ἢ ὃ περδεῖν διὰ πλεί-
 ρης ὁπῆς περδεμένης κρατήσαντες, δέον αὐτὰς ἀποπῆσαι
 λαμβάνειν, τοτὲ μὲν λεληθῆναι, τοτὲ δὲ περφανῶς τὰς
 ἀποφιδεύσεις πρεσβεύει δόξα (namely *Aria-
 nism* then newly condemn'd in the Council of
Nice) διαφόροις ὀφειλουμένοις τοῖς ἐλεγχοῖς· βελομένοι
 ὃ παγιῶσαι τὰ ζιζανιώδη φυτεγρήματα, δεδοίκασι τῆς
 ἐκκλησίας, καὶ ἐκλίνουσι τῆς ἐφόρου· καὶ ταύτην τῆς τ' ἐπι-
 σκόπας κήρυκα ἐκπολεμέσιν. *Arianism* they propos'd
 to themselves for their Port, but what
 course to steer they were not resolv'd, and
 so they multiply'd, and shifted, and vary'd
 their own Creeds, and were perpetually
 calling out for a *Synod*, a *Synod*, as loud al-
 most as *St. Jerom's Totus Orbis Arianus*
 groan'd, that *Totus Orbis* which the Author
 of *R. and L.* had observ'd to be the Dar-
 ling of our Innovatours. *Whom does he*
mean by those Innovatours? (Or. p. 173, 174.)
 The *Origines* demand, and the Question
 was not unseasonable. *Does he mean the*
Divines of the Church of England? Certain-
 ly much rather the Socinians and the Dis-
 ciples of *Philostorgius* and *Sandius*, and all
 that Heterodox Fraternity. But why the
 Divines of the Church of England? O (re-
 ply the *Origines Ibid.*) because the Divines
 of the Church of England are not so mad as
 to make use of it to prove an Apostacy of the

Catholick Church, for which End the Author of *R.* and *L.* at the same time supposes those Innovatours he mentions to have used it. This is excellent Logick; Let's have a little more on't. The Author of *R.* and *L.* had presum'd that *St. Jerom* was only complaining of the *World's* being cheated into *Arianism* (in which very Words the Author of the *Or.* has express'd himself p. 152.) by the *Bishops* being outwitted by an handful of *Arians*. The Author of the *Or.* denies the Assertion. Why? Because *St. Jerom* plainly says the name of *Substance* was there, i. e. in the Coucile of *Ariminum*, laid aside, and the Council of *Nice* condemn'd. But might not both be effected by a Cheat and Trepan? No, for the *Orthodox Bishops* were so much aware of the Contrivance as to declare and protest against it. Which way then, I wou'd know, cou'd the Designers compass their Ends, but by Wiles and Stratagems? And 'tis certain from the whole History of that Juncture, that they made such a progress toward the compassing of 'em, as the Author of *R.* and *L.* tells us they made. So that the Truth of his Relation instead of being disprov'd is very much corroborated by this Objection of the Author of the *Or.* And now for an Epilogue to the Tragedy, observe, Sir the finishing Argument! *R.* and *L.* gives us to understand that they, i. e.

the

the Bishops in the Council of *Ariminum* were frighted into Consent at last. The Or. grant they were so. (Or. pag. 175.) But what then becomes of the Infallibility of Councils? As if it concern'd the Authour of *R.* and *L.* what became on't ; and as if the *Origines* themselves had not a little before confess'd that the Authour of *R.* and *L.* level'd his Observation about St. *Jerom's* Words against those who wou'd make use of 'em to prove an Apostasy of the Catholick Church from the true Faith ; but what's this to the Infallibility of Councils? or if Infallibility of Councils must be brought in by *Head and Shoulders*, what Instance can make more effectually against the Notion of their Infallibility than this advanc'd by the Authour of *R.* and *L.* viz, *that the Bishops in the Council of Ariminum were so weakly overreach'd and outwitted by an handfull of Arians?* In fine it was resolv'd, right or wrong, that this Enemy to designs of Moderation and Comprehension shou'd have no Quarter. He deserv'd to be pelted with a thousand little Insinuations. To be thrust into the List of those who are ready to say any thing to serve a turn (Or. p. 158.) was really better Usage than he cou'd have expected from the Comprehensive Charity and Gratitude of many of his old Acquaintance.

I have done with the Objections of the *Origines*, and shall only trouble you with a few Lines by way of *Corollary*, upon One or Two more of your Friend's *Charitable Well-wishers*. The *Origines* had lay'd only Unsincerity to his Charge, but the Authour of certain Marginal Notes in MS. upon some Pages of the First Part of *R.* and *L.* bequeath'd to the *Bodleian* Library has brought no less than *Blasphemy* into the Indictment. A very dreadfull Article! if it cou'd be made out, as I hope it cannot from the words of *R.* and *L.* (*Pag.* 28, 29.) upon which this Animadversion is pass'd, and which are these, *It is but a crude Expression (not to call it prophane, because it is so common by customary mistake) to affirm that Kings are Supream Governours under Christ. They are and ever were so under God, but so as to be Superiour to Christ, as Christ is Head of his Church within their Dominions.* In defiance to this the Margin, *First as Christ is our Redeemer by his Blood, and Head of the Church he is King of Kings; Secondly as he is Head of the Church, all the Kings who are real Christians are Members of his Body, the holy Church. Now to say that any Member of the Body is superiour to the Head is in reason ridiculous, and in his case of our Blessed Saviour, Blasphemous. Thirdly, Christ is Head over all Kings, and he is such a Head of the Church,*

in

in whom all Fulness dwells, and he is the Head of all Principalities and Powers. I omit the Texts of Scripture which the Animadverter applys, as being some false-quoted, and all turn'd to a Secular Sense instead of that Spiritual one, which is proper to them. Agen, upon Pag. 30. of R. and L. All Kings, Pagan or Christian, are superiour to all their Subjects, Pagan or Christian; but to say they are superiour to our Blessed Saviour, is (what never any Man said before, and) impious, and afterwards upon Pag. 35. Kings are receiv'd as Members of the Christian Church, ergo Christ is their Head, ergo he is their Superiour. It's not to be question'd but that Christ as Head of his Church is in a Spiritual Acceptation superiour to all Kings as they are Members of his Church, and as God superiour to all Kings by virtue of his Universal Dominion over his Creatures; yet as the Mediatour of the New Covenant, 1 Tim. 2. 5. (and as such, notwithstanding the Remarkers Note, that he was $\delta\epsilon\iota\upsilon\delta\epsilon\omega\tau\omicron$, God and Man, he was Man, not but still he was Mediatour in that Person, which was both God and Man) or as the Head and Founder of the Christian Society he strips both himself and his Officers of all Pretences to Temporal Power. These Words immediately follow those upon which the Animadverter has pronounc'd his Anathema,

and which clearly explain the Author's meaning to be this, *that Christ founded his Church in his State of Humiliation, and as at that time he submitted himself to the Authority of the Civil Magistrate, and to his Followers and Disciples earnestly inculcated the Duty of Obedience; so after his Resurrection and Glorification he never so much as licens'd his Apostles to assume any the least Authority over others, but what was purely Spiritual, nor to pretend that, because the Author of their Religion was God as well as Man, therefore he as being Head of his Church once did and still does dispense to his Spiritual Officers a Measure of Temporal Authority to be exercis'd in his Name; and so left not the Prerogatives of Princes the same as he found 'em.* To this Sense the Author of R. and L. no doubt design'd his Assertions shou'd be constru'd (as the Animadverter cou'd not chuse but understand 'tis plain from his Marginal Note, Pag. 31.) in opposition to the Hildebrandine Principle, and that too without any Repugnancy or Prejudice to the Nature of that Power, by which our Saviour whipp'd the People out of the Temple, Matth. 21.12. John 2. 15. and by which he instituted, that Impious and Contumacious Persons shou'd in this Life be excommunicated, *quod est futuri Judicij præjudicium*, and by which to affright wicked Persons to their Duty, he gave his Apostles

shews a Miraculous Power, tradere Satana, and inflicted Temporal Punishments, so on Ananias and Sapphira, and Elymas, (See Marginal Remarks upon P. 27, 28. of R. and L.) for the first of these Acts he perform'd as God, to whom the Temple and all the Services of it were sacred ; and those temporal Punishments which by the Hands of the Apostles he inflicted upon *Ananias*, &c. were according to our Animadverter's own Confession *Miraculous*, and therefore if they had not been, as to the Occasion, Efficient-Cause and End of 'em, purely Spiritual, ought not to pass into Arguments of a settled, perpetual, inherent Authority. And then as for Excommunication, that is in it self a Punishment, if I mistake not, properly Spiritual, and taken for such among all Parties ; so that we cannot but conclude *R. and L.* had never abounded so much with Blasphemy and Impiety, if the Remarker had abounded a little more in Candour and Perspicacity. Upon which Consideration I shou'd not have mention'd to you his Marginal Reflexions, but that, being made publick by devolving to the *Bodleian* Library, I conceiv'd it adviseable to send you this account of them, which, perhaps, you may have Occasion some time or other to make use of. I shall not transcribe his little Note upon p. 19. No body ever deny'd

ny'd but *Grotius* might have been consulted. But as for his Note upon p. 32. he has very unfortunately betray'd either his Ignorance or Unsincerity, or both, for whereas in the Margin upon these Words of *Baronius*, *Quod armorum potentiâ &c.* quoted in R. and L. he asserts, *Extant hæc verba apud Baronium loco citato scil. Ad Annum 650. n. 14. sed non dicit Baronius Mahometem fuisse Typum Antichristi, quia Religionem suam gladio propagabat*, the Words quoted are not to be found, nor any thing to the same purpose in *Baronius*, Ad Annum 650. (*At least not in the Editions I have met with*) n. 14. which the Printer had put by mistake for n. 11. and there they are mention'd as Part of Pope Gregory's Prediction concerning those unhappy Times, *cum Totus oriens furvo velut obdueto pallio, densa hæresum caligine obscuratus penitus appareret, cum & Typum quendam gesserit Antichristi, qui haud pridem novam perfidiam falsis Vaticinijs Mahometes in Arabia statuisset, & armorum potentiâ tot Provincias nullo ferme negotio per suos posteros ejusdem sectæ homines subjugasset.* Behold! the very Words cited in R. and L! but taking my leave of Marginal Notes I pass on to Dr. Wake's Appeal; and believe me, Sir, I cannot understand how so good a Politician shou'd take so much pains to depreciate an Authority, which

which at the same time he condescends to make his Advantage of in his own Justification; not to mention the Awkwardness of the Acknowledgment, (how much or how little soever the Citation help'd his Cause,) I will declare my self oblig'd to such a Writer for his Suffrage, and express my Gratitude in a Volly of Personal Reflexions, both under One. From a Courtier, Sir, you will expect fair Language, at least when 'tis for his Turn to give it. Mark then the Doctor's pretty discreet Introduction to Testimonies upon the strength of which he would build! *I shall from him (Bishop Taylour) descend but to One more, whom I fitly place the last of his Order; And to whose Judgment, tho' I pay no more than it deserves, yet I cannot but think it may have some Weight with those, whom I am now concern'd especially to convince.* (Appeal p.97,98.) As extraordinary is his Compliment at Parting! (P. 102.) *But I shall not insist any longer on this Authority; but pass on to consider the Judgment of an Author or Two of a Lower Rank, but whose Learning and Steadiness will much more recommend Them to all Sober and Indifferent Persons, And for a Specimen of his Author's Unsteadyness, he has produc'd out of him Two different Opinions about the same Matter, as if what he before gave the Christian Prince as his own due, He afterwards*
granted

granted him by the Concession of the Clergy, (Appeal, p. 101.) interpreting, perhaps, the Imperial Title to Supremacy by the Concession of the Church, as a Derogation to the Title resulting from the Reason of the Thing: So that because the Author of the *Case of the Church of England* stated had affirm'd, That by the Example of the Primitive Church, our Bishops submitted the Exercise of that Power which the Governours of the Church in all Ages enjoy'd, a Power of making Canons and Constitutions, for Discipline and Good Order, to the King's Sovereign Authority, therefore the Author of the Discourse upon *Ecclesiastical Polity* differ'd from the Author of the *Case of the C. of E.* in maintaining that the Power wherewith Christ invested the Governours of his Church in the Apostolical Age was purely Spiritual; that they had no Authority to inflict Temporal Punishments, or to force Men to submit to their Canons, Laws and Penalties; that they only declar'd the Laws of God, and denounced the Threatnings annex'd to them; but that when Christianity was become the Imperial Religion, then began its Government to resettle where Nature had plac'd it, and the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction was annex'd to the Civil Power. Now 'till the Doctor has prov'd as well as asserted the Unsteadyness of his Author from the Inconsistency of these Two Positions, not the highest

highest Exaltations (Appeal p. 101.) can ever bear him harmless, nor all his Professions of Sincerity stand him in any stead. I do not concern my self here to enquire whether his Quotations from your Friend suit his Purpose as he apprehends ; but am sure Justice is not done 'till a Charge be better prov'd, or the Person under Accusation publicly acquitted.

And yet as unkindly and dishonourably as Dr. *W.* is pleas'd to treat the Memory of your Friend, Dr. *Wake's* main Adversary has dealt even worse by him, which, I confess, is the more surprizing, because your Friend had so very particularly concern'd himself in stating the due Boundaries of the Ecclesiastical and Civil Powers, in order to assert, if not those Particular Rights of the Church, yet at least those General Ones upon which the Particular are built, the Defence whereof this Adversary of the Doctor's has pretended to undertake. His Words are these (as the Reader may meet with 'em toward the beginning of his Preface.) " The Right of actually drawing up
 " beforehand what they thought convenient to have establish'd (*in Convocation*)
 " is a very convenient Right for Princes
 " that meditate new Schemes of Church-Government. Twelve Years ago enforc'd
 " by the Pen of a PARKER, or a CART-
 " WRIGHT,

“ WRIGHT, it might have done great Ser-
 vice : It would have help’d on all the
 “ pious Designs then upon the Anvil ; and
 “ if the Asserter of it had not been a Bi-
 “ shop, to be sure it would have made him
 “ one. How this Wonderful *Sarcasm* came
 to be thrown in, I know not, but presume
 it was meant for one of his many *Qualifying*
Digressions. Some great People in Being,
 the Author was sensible, might grow an-
 gry with this Argument, and that which
 made him conceal his own, tempted him,
 no doubt, to cast a blurr upon other Peo-
 ple’s Names. But I need not insist upon
 that. He shall be, for once, Judge in his
 own Case; let’s observe what he deter-
 mines (*Seven Pages further*) — *Could we*
excuse his (Dr. Wake’s) Ill Principles, yet
what shall we say to those injurious Reflexi-
ons that accompany them? those Sights and
Reproaches he so liberally casts on his Or-
der, when it has the ill luck to come in his
way? Never more, for Modesty’s sake, let
this Gentleman put such Questions to Dr.
Wake : No, let him read over his own Preface
again, and then bring himself to Confession.
Let him blush as long as he lives to Apolo-
gize, as he afterwards does, for the old Popish
Clergy, while he loads those of his own Or-
der, whose Endeavours in the Service and
for the Interest of the Church, Men of Sense
 and

and Sincerity have always been pleas'd to approve, with his little Insinuations and Aspersions. He rebukes Dr. Wake for *not distinguishing between the Men, and their Popery* ; suppose the Worst with the Mob, and what even in his Candour himself has not expressly suppos'd, was it not equally his Duty to *distinguish between the Men and their Popery, but he must censure them in gross* (to borrow his own Expressions) *and in such a manner sometimes, as to leave the Reader in doubt, whether the Function it self were not in Fault?* Common Justice (he lets us know Pag. 454. of the Book) *oblig'd him to say (somewhat) in behalf of that great Minister (Cardinal Wolsey) who had real Faults enough, not to be loaded with untrue Ones :* And did not Common Justice oblige him, at least so far to favour the Memory of one of his own Order, as not to make it odious by such four and impertinent Suggestions, as he has neither essay'd to make good, nor is able? *They that defend dead Cardinals cannot, (as he conceives, p. 455.) be suppos'd guilty of Flattery or Design.* Be it so. Yet let him understand that *they who slander Dead Bishops of the Church of England, (and that unprovok'd, I presume ; I'm sure, wide enough of his Argument) will be suppos'd very guilty of both.* He ought to have consider'd how preposterous it appears for the
Man

Man who pretends to defend the *Privileges* of the Church of *England*, to expose the Failures of her *Prelates*, even although he cou'd fairly have made out his Allegations, for perhaps the Number of those Persons who judging of a Religion by the Characters of its Professours, and (with much better Reason) of the Characters of its Professours by the Accounts they receive from others of the same Profession, are mov'd to think amiss of it, is much more considerable than of Those who measure and mistake the Rights and Powers of a Church by the Opinion and upon the Authority of One or Two of its *Inferiour Members*. And therefore if *Dr. Wake* is oblig'd to submit and own himself utterly mistaken throughout the *Dispute*, which Those Two are concern'd in: (p.460.) certainly *Dr. Wake's* Antagonist ought to be made sensible of his own Mismanagement and Partiality, in treating Those of his own Order so uncandidly.

Having proceeded thus far in Vindication of your Friend, I shall now release you, and absolutely refuse engaging in Underwork with *Magpies* and *Starlings*, for I cou'd not excuse it to You, nor to my self, shou'd I look into the little Malice, Lampoons and Gimcracks of a hundred Punters, Epigrammatists, Barber's Prentices, Old Women, and *Anthony Woods* at the
Head

Head of 'em, brandishing his *Anonymous Third Collection of Papers*, and the Testimonies of his *Xaverian Vouchers*, for it seems the Man was a Stranger to the *Phanatico-Papistical* Stratagem of representing as Profelytes the profest Enemies of *that Cause*. The Conjectures and Boasts of a Jesuite, or perhaps, of a *Collectour personating a Jesuite* pass'd with him for so good Evidence, that he thought it needless to get Information from those Persons whom a much better Character might have recommended, and daily Opportunities of Knowing and Observing qualify'd more especially for *Witnesses*, and who still remain ready by the most solemn Attestations to confront a Thousand of his *Nameless Rhapsodists* and *Dreaming Loyolites* of *Leige*.

But I do not wonder at his Credulity when I recollect how much he has run himself in debt for Materials to *Marvel*, the *Merry Andrew* of their Party, a Fellow that wou'd not profess himself a Fanatick for fear of disgracing the Name, so very defective in Sense as to mistake his own Quarter-Quibbles, Calumnies and Ribaldry, for Sound Reason and Argument; and at the same time so fraught with Impudence, as even to impose 'em upon the World for such.

S

If

(258)

If, Sir, by so long a Letter, I have
trespass'd upon your Patience, 'tis in Obe-
dience to your Commands. And that
Consideration I hope may more than
barely reconcile you to the Freedom which
has now been taken by,

Sir,

Your Most

Humble Servant.

December the
15th. 1699.

I
R
fa
for
up
Ta
arn
Mo
wh
or
test
reig

A
R E C I P E
F O R
L O V E R S.

LETTER XII.

My Friend,

Love is certainly the Ruling Passion of our Nature. In wrestling with our Reason, it tries such a *Lock* as very seldom fails. Fear, if any Passion, may match it for Force; but Fear is indeed bottom'd upon Love, either of Our Selves or Others. Take away that Motive and Terror's disarm'd. And indeed nothing removes that Motive so effectually as the Passion of Love, which whether conversant about Our selves or Others, puts us in course upon the hottest Service. And as Love is the *Sovereign Passion*, so 'tis the most *Universal*.

An old Follow that has never had the small Pox is not half so great a Rarity, as one that in his life was never smitten. Nature upon our Formation ramms her Gunpowder into the Cavities of the Heart, the *Magazine* is born with us, and tho' for some time by constant care we may prevent an *Explosion*, yet sooner or later some Fair One's Eye sets fire to the Train, and blows up all our Philosophy and Resolutions. We may pretend as much as we please to call our selves to account, set Reasons against Reasons, aggravate to our Understandings the Folly of our Desires; but when once we've swallowed the Hook, there's no swimming off. 'Tis ten thousand to one, but so long as the Object of our Admiration is in Being, the Flame lives: as when a *Volcano* has once broke out, the Mountain must burn, 'till the Fewel's totally consum'd. Eagerness of Desire overworks the Spirits, they either fly off or flag in the pursuit, and the Lover lingers and languishes 'till he wins the Lady or loses himself.

Strange *vehemence* of *Inclination*! And is there no Remedy then in case our Circumstances require it? Are we Predestinated and Necessitated to this Servitude? Is there violence offer'd to our Wills, and have we no choice at last? 'Twere a Reproach upon

on Providence to think it: If we take things in time, observe the first Symptoms of Disturbance, or having yielded too far, gather up our Resolutions, and force our way, -----why, we are still Beauty-proof. But, there's a Satisfaction in Submitting; we play booty against our selves, we condescend to parly and then we're undone:

I am verily persuaded, most People receive the Impressions we are speaking of much earlier than is commonly suppos'd; especially as the World goes now. Little Bratts are taught to have their Wives before they're big enough for Breeches, and Girls must learn their Airs, and their Love-Songs forsooth! 'er they can read their Primmers; nay they must have their *Babies* too to quicken their Imaginations, when, God knows, they want little Prompting. No: they are naturally forward enough, and shall be trying their skill at Amour and Intreague almost as soon as they can stammer. Pretty Master and Pretty Miss creep hand in hand under the *Carpet*, and there set billing together as long as they please. And all this passes for pure Apishness, whereas in good Truth the Puppets are grown fond, the Passions glimmer, and their little Heart strings glowe. Now if the old People will indulge these Proficients, if instead of checking the first Offers

and Motions, as of the other Passions, they'll second 'em, they may thank themselves if sometime or other they see their Children either Lunaticks or Libertines. But to come forwards.

From Sixteen to Thirty, I account the Amorous Period. However most Men turn'd of Forty may be look'd upon as past their Climacterick of Love, for then the Tide of Vigour begins to ebb, the Judgment has got ground, and the little blind God is almost out of Breath. How to keep him under Discipline 'till then, is the main Enquiry. 'Tis certain, grave Precautions and Admonitions are thrown away upon Persons passionately fond. Nay, were they in general Terms to come out of a Pulpit, I am afraid they would set some Peoples Imaginations on work the wrong way instead of guiding their Inclinations the right. In short, as the Vehemence of Love is Foolish and Fantastical, so the Remedies of it should be Imaginary and Antick, such as are usually prescribed to those few in the World, who by too great Intention of Thought and Application to Study have quitted the Consciousness of their own Nature, and imagin'd themselves Bears and Baboons. And indeed to make Goddesses of *Ladys*, and Gods of *Beaux*, is much at one as to mistake our selves for *Looking-Glasses* and *Butterflies*. The

The first step to be made toward the Cure propos'd is a Resolution in the Patient to absent himself, for sometime at least, from the belov'd Object. Or in case he wants power to keep away, any Friend that knows or can guess at his Circumstances may form Stratagems to divert him from paying Visits, yet so as that the Design may lie unperceiv'd. And therefore if the Party imploy'd in this Affair be one whom the Lover presumes a Stranger to his Intreague, the Plot may be carried on the better. Let him place an entertaining Book or a Bottle in his way, bring in his neighbours upon him, call his Hounds about him, and surprize him with variety of Amusements, especially of such as suit his Genius and Disposition. Nay, let him rather infuse *Opium* into the poor Gentleman's Glass, than suffer him to come within sight of the Dear One. But particularly let his *Governour* study to recommend some other Lady to his Fancy. Such *Items* will throw his Affections out of their old Channel. Lovers like Infants are to be cheated out of one *Play-thing* by presenting *another*. The *Hobby-horse* supplants the *Rattle*, the Diminutive *Nine-pins* Succeed to the *Hobby-horse*. And then there's a mighty Art in so translating the Passion as that it may lose strength by every Movement : in so *brewing* the de-

fires that both the *Spirit* and the *Quantity* may insensibly perish. But 'though we fail in that Point, there's a great deal in change of Objects. At least, if Love be once taken to pieces, 'twill hardly be set together again so well as before. Besides, as often as it quits an Object upon which it has once fasten'd, it leaves a great deal of its influence behind. This Prescription if made use of early, cannot but take effect. And the more you distribute the Passion, the sooner 'tis lost; as a large Estate among a Multitude of Heirs.

To facilitate the Operation of this *Physick*, 'twere well if the *Nurse* could perswade the *Lover*, that his Mistress wants some of those Charms and Excellences which he ascribes to her; not expressly and bluntly, but by occasional Suggestions, and as a Stranger to his Friends high Opinion of her: For the purpose; *Your Gray-hound Bitch, Sir, would run well, if she were not as full behind as a certain Lady in such a Parish.* Now if *Madam* be extravagantly prominent behind, and his Patient principally admire her Outside, you palm the Remembrance of his Goddesses Deformity upon his Conscience, and so perhaps in some measure damp the Fury of his Flame. Or thus; *I admire your Ladyship's Fann, but methinks that young Sheperd in't looks as foppish, and foolish, as if*
he

he were descended of such a Family----- to
 a Lady that takes her *Gallant* for a *fine*
Gentleman and a *Wit*, whether he be really
 such or not. And no body (as I said before)
 so fit for whispering this Hint as a person
 suppos'd unacquainted with the Opinion of
 the Party to be recovered. His being dis-
 interested implys *Impartiality*; the first ex-
 cuses the Freedom, the second argues the
 Equity of the Observation. Not but a Man
 of Discretion and Resolution will command
 himself so far, at least if he has not waded
 out of his Depth in Love, as to set to Criti-
 cizing of his own accord. He will start
 and bestir himself, and rowze his Faculty
 of Recollection. He will go thro' a course
 of Physiognomy on purpose, and entertain
 himself as much with confounding Blemish-
 es, as *Apelles* with collecting good Features.
 Nay he will invert his Prejudices, and de-
 duct from the Lady's Charms to Multiply
 her Imperfections. And the best on't is,
 there's no Woman upon Earth without De-
 fects enow for a Man to exercise his Ta-
 lent of Censure upon. As well instructed
 as many of the Sex have prov'd themselves,
 in the Art of Dissimulation and Varnish,
 their faults will sometimes peep abroad.
 Either Falshood, or ill Humour, or Sillyness,
 breaks Prison; or the Paint trickles down,
 or the false Locks fall off. On t'other
 hand,

hand, the Ladys may cure their Likings by contemplating the ill Properties and Qualities of our Sex. There's Work enough cut out for them, I am sure, if they're in the Humour: For our Purposes, Persons, and Practices are really more exceptionable than those of Womankind, without so much Skill and artificial Modesty as to set 'em off to the best Advantage. Not to mention that our Constitutions and Concerns permit us to take greater Liberties, and the more Liberties Men have, the more, alas! they have to *abuse*. But 'tis not my Business to compare Sexes.

These are a few general Rules for reducing Lovers. I am sensible they will not reach every Case, altho' I make no Question, but every Case might be as well provided against, if all the Symptoms and Circumstances of the Malady, the natural Disposition of the Party Distemper'd, and the Character of the Party doted on, were to come under Consideration. Sometimes to beget the very Idea of Coldness and Indifference in a poor *Admirer* does him service, especially if we strike home with the occasion, and hold him in Hand with Roman-tick Flourishes upon the Topicks of *Apathy* and *Supineness*. Sometimes such a Lecture shall seem a Provocation, and make him
turn

turn *Knight-Errant* in defence of his Malady: Sometimes a little Raillery puts him by his Flames and Raptures, if it be not overseason'd with Satyr, for then instead of jesting him into Soberness, you exasperate him against your self, and that ruins all. To prevent it, a wise Man would wrap up his Jest in serious Professions of Respect and Friendship. He would take all Disobliging Suppositions and Representations to himself, or imagine a third Person to fix 'em upon. If the Lady's Birth, Merit and Fortune will not answer his, the Dignity of his Family and Largeness of his Means ought to be chim'd in his Ears; at least a few random Inculcations upon the Advantages of a better Coat of Arms, and a great many more Acres may stagger his Resolutions. Or if his own Birth, Desert, or Estate bear no Proportion with *Madam's*, and she insists upon't, take t'other end of the Staff, urge the Ungenerousness of such Demands, and how little worthy of a Gallant Man that Woman is, who sets her self to *Auction*; that an Heiress influenc'd by such Mercenary Considerations is, as it were, an *Honourable Prostitute*; and that a much better Choice might be made out of those Few of the Tender Sex, who regard the value of the *Person* more than that of the *Patrimony*.

Nor

Nor would I be mistaken as tho' it were my Opinion that all passionate Love ought to be discourag'd. In some cases 'tis matter of Duty, particularly between Man and Wife; for a *Stoical Couple*, I'm sure, can never be happy. The fondness must be mutual too, and every Rebound of it answer'd : Miss a Stroak and the Game's lost. But besides, it's *antecedently* necessary. The Philtres of mere Friendship and Acquaintance are not sufficient to venture with upon such a Relation; They must be heighten'd by an Eagerness of Affection, kindled into Briskness and Ardour; the Comforts of Matrimony will pall apace else. And therefore to constrain Young People to *match for Money*, is little better than *Pairing of Coach Horses*.

After all a Man of Spirit and Worth, before he submits to be Miserable, will set about the Comparison between his Mistress and Himself. He will weigh Merit against Merit, and be determin'd by the Scale. If her Perfections turn it, he will more than ballance 'em with her Pride. If his own, he must be sensible he should have got the worst of the Bargain, had he obtain'd his Wishes. And why must he die for a Woman that slights him, when she has more reason to dote upon him that admires her? Why must he cheapen his own good Qualities

lities to overrate her *Romantick* ones ? No :
 Let her Ladyship try if New Customers
 will *bid her more*, while her *Humble Servant*
 betters his Bargain at *the other End of the*
Fair.

What I have said of *Passionate Love* I
 beg may not be understood of *Libi-*
dinous and *Dis honourable Desires*. These
 admit of no *Qualification*. They are to
 be stifled in the first Conception; nay,
 if possible, the very Idea of them should
 be forestall'd. Give 'em the least Counte-
 nance, and you lie at their Mercy.
 Then too they are utterly inconsistent
 with all Generosity and Steadiness of
 Affection. Not One, nor Two, nor Ten
 Objects can retain 'em. They are so
 very Vain and Desultory, that at last,
 as when the Palate has been over-in-
 dulg'd, the very choicest Variety will by
 no means relish; besides that our Friend,
 Sir, for whose benefit you have been
 pleas'd to advise with such a *Mounte-*
bank as My self, has no occasion for
 Advice upon the Topick of Chastity
 and Continence. By the way; Let him
 not know you heard from me, least
 he should suspect you follow any Dire-
 ctions of mine in managing him. A
 course of Physick would not be half
 so severe a Pennance, if 'twere not
 formally

(270)

formally prescrib'd. I have now at last
obey'd your Commands, and shall em-
brace all occasions of approving my
self,

Sir,

Your &c.

Jan. 11th. 1699.
700.



FINIS.

